

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

DISSERTATION

INFIX-T FORMS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

by

Milton Lorimer Boyle, Jr.

Bachelor of Arts, Harvard University, 1950
Bachelor of Divinity, Newton Theological Institution, 1963

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

1969

Approved by

First Reader

Neil Richardson
Professor of Old Testament

Second Reader

Samuel Frederick Bask
Professor of Old Testament

INFIX-T FORMS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW
(Order No. _____)

Milton Lorimer Boyle, Jr., Ph.D.
Boston University Graduate School, 1969

Major Professor: H. Neil Richardson, Professor of Old Testament

As is well known, some ancient Semitic languages formed verbal and nominal themes by means of a letter t infixed after the first consonant of the root or stem. This phenomenon has been studied extensively in Akkadian, Arabic, Amorite, Ugaritic, Phoenician and Moabite, but its existence in Biblical Hebrew has been noted only rarely. This dissertation attempts to show that such forms are far more prevalent in Biblical Hebrew than has been heretofore recognized, and that the use of such forms was probably common in the early strata of that language.

Biblical Hebrew is first shown to be closely related to other Semitic tongues of the ancient period, and a comparative study of the grammar of this language with the others is justified. From this basis, the use and character of infix-t constructions in Semitic languages are studied. Based chiefly on a comprehensive analysis of Ugaritic, it is shown that infix-t forms are not primarily reflexive, as has been generally held, but they rather lend intensifying force to the action expressed by the verb. Such forms generally occur in contexts of urgency and emotional involvement. The action is intensified frequently by indication of repetitive or durative action. An analysis of the use of infix-t in the other languages lends supporting evidence to this theory.

The study then turns to a search of the Massoretic Text for infix-

t forms in Biblical Hebrew. The few occurrences previously noted by scholars are discussed and analyzed in light of the conclusions drawn concerning the meaning of infix-t in the related Semitic languages. A study of analytical lexicons proves fruitless, and it is theorized that infix-t forms which may have existed in early strata of Biblical Hebrew have been obliterated by later scribes who neither recognized nor understood the use of such forms. Thus some forms were deliberately changed to conform to their knowledge and understanding, and in this way only unrecognized infix-t forms were allowed to remain in the biblical text. These unrecognized, or hidden, infix-t forms occur in the following categories:

1. Some Biblical Hebrew words have been thought to be derived from ש"י roots, while in reality they are from weak, i.e., original biradical roots. The middle t is in reality an infix-t.
2. Words whose initial consonant is a sibilant usually exhibit the phenomenon of metathesis when the following consonant is a t: ts > st. Accordingly, the hitpa^cel stem of such verbs is pronounced and written as though the t were infixed after the first root radical. In most of these cases, the construction is actually prefixed-t where metathesis has occurred. In some cases, however, the construction is not metathesized, but the word is a true infix-t.

Conversely, there are several hitpa^cel words which do not conform to the usual reflexive force of that stem. These appear to be related to the Akkadian iterative-durative -tan- stem, and are thus seen to have originally been infix rather than prefix-t constructions.

3. The pi^cel stem of some middle t roots may also be infix-t if the t of

the stem has been assimilated to the t of the root. The possibility is also noted that assimilation of the infix-t may have occurred with other consonants, especially dentals, and the result would appear to be a pi^cel or pu^cal form, i.e., with doubled second radical. No certain examples can be cited here because of the similarity in meaning between the intensive D (pi^cel) and infix-t stems.

The conclusion is drawn that infix-t constructions were once a prominent feature of Biblical Hebrew. It may be that the forms crystallized in later times and were used by writers who were unconscious of their true construction and force.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Problem of the Dissertation	
	Definitions	
	Methodology	
	The Scope of the Dissertation	
	The Importance of the Dissertation	
II.	THE RELATIONSHIP OF BIBLICAL HEBREW TO OTHER SEMITIC LANGUAGES.	12
III.	SURVEY OF INFIX-T FORMS.	44
IV.	INFIX-T FORMS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW	98
V.	CONCLUSIONS.	142
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	145
	VITA	154

ABBREVIATIONS

AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
ANET	J. B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.
ArOr	Archiv Orientalní.
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
EG	A. Dillman, Ethiopic Grammar.
GA	Arthur Ungnad, Grammatik des Akkadischen.
GAG	W. von Soden, Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik.
GAL	W. Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language.
GHG	William Gesenius, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.
GPL	Zelig S. Harris, A Grammar of the Phoenician Language.
GVG	Carl Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen.
HGHS	H. Bauer, P. Leander, Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des alten Testaments.
ICGSL	S. Moscati, An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages.
IDB	Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible.
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature.
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies.

JPOS	Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review.
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies.
MKT	J. Aistleitner, Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra.
MT	Massoretic Text: Kittel's Ninth Edition.
MVAeG	Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft.
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
PPG	J. Friedrich, Phönizisch-punische Grammatik.
UL	C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Literature.
UT	C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook.
WUS	J. Aistleitner, Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache.
WZKM	Weiner Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem of the Dissertation

In the study of ancient Semitic languages there is no problem more difficult than that of the verbal systems of those languages. At the same time, there is nothing more vital to correct translation and proper interpretation of ancient texts than a thorough understanding of the verb. This is, of course, especially true in relation to the Old Testament where every word and phrase has deep meaning and considerable importance for a large religious community.

Difficulties inherent in the Hebrew verb were first systematically attacked by Godfrey Rolles Driver in his classic work, Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System, published in 1936.¹ Driver built upon foundations already laid by G. Bergsträsser² and Hans Bauer,³ but he drew chiefly upon his excellent command of Hebrew and his knowledge of Akkadian. He omitted Ugaritic because the discoveries at Ras Shamra were still in the process of decipherment and interpretation,⁴ but it

¹Godfrey Rolles Driver, Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936).

²G. Bergsträsser, Hebräische Grammatik, I (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1929).

³EHHS.

⁴Driver, Problems, V, VI: "I have intentionally avoided using the Ugaritian texts from Ras Samrah; for I do not think it prudent to

has now become clearly evident that Ugaritic is an indispensable tool for the study of Semitic languages, particularly Biblical Hebrew.¹

It is well known that Semitic languages of the Second Millennium B.C. formed certain verbal themes by infixing a "t" radical after the first consonant of the verbal stem. These verbal themes are found abundantly in the Akkadian dialects, occasionally in the less well-attested Amorite, Moabite and Phoenician and commonly in Arabic. They have been discovered in frequent use in Ugaritic, which has provided a broader base from which further studies may be undertaken. In spite of the fact, however, that infix-t forms were employed in the related languages of the geographical area and the same time period in which Biblical Hebrew takes its origins, most grammarians deny the existence of these forms in the Hebrew language.²

Since the discovery of the Ugaritic texts, some scholars have published articles in which possible infix-t forms from the Massoretic Text are described. F. M. Cross, Jr., and D. N. Freedman even state quite flatly, "We may be virtually certain therefore, that the hiqtatal conjugation was used in tenth century Hebrew."³ To date, no one has

use a language which is in course of being deciphered largely with the help of Hebrew to throw light on the unsolved problems in Hebrew itself."

¹See C. H. Gordon, UT, 1-2 and especially Mitchell Dahood, Psalms I, 1-50 (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965). Relative to the controversy regarding Dahood's use of Ugaritic in the study of the Psalms, see the review articles by John L. McKenzie, CBQ, 29 (1967), 139, and David A. Robertson, JBL, 85 (1966), 484-486. Dahood, himself, discusses and answers the controversies in the Introduction to Psalms II, 51-100, pages xiii-xxvii.

²See below, pp. 99-100.

³F. M. Cross, Jr., and D. N. Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," JBL, 67 (1948), p. 200, n. 16.

undertaken a careful study of the Massoretic Text to determine the extent to which these forms are employed in Biblical Hebrew.

This paper is a study of infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew to determine (1) the frequency of their occurrence in the Massoretic Text, (2) the meanings and possible interpretations of these forms, (3) the possible formation in Biblical Hebrew of secondary word roots from infix-t forms, and (4) the possibility that infix-t forms were a regular feature of early Biblical Hebrew.

Definitions

General linguistic terms are used as they are defined in

A Dictionary of Linguistics, by Mario A. Pei and Frank Gaynor, (New York: Philosophical Library, 1954), and linguistic terms specific to a given language are used as they are employed in the following grammars:

Akkadian: Wolfram von Soden, Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1952). (GAG)

Arabic: William Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1967). (GAL)

Aramaic: Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen (Halle/Salle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927).

Ethiopic: August Dillman, Ethiopic Grammar, 2nd ed. by Carl Bezold, trans. by James A. Crichton (London: Williams and Norgate, 1907). (EG)

Hebrew: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch, revised by A. E. Cowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963). (GHG)

Phoenician: Zelig S. Harris, A Grammar of the Phoenician Language (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1936). (GPL)

Syriac: L. H. Brockington, Syriac Grammar (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).

Comparative Semitics: Sabatino Moscati, Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964). (ICGSL)

The following terms require special definition here:

Biblical Hebrew: In this paper, the term Biblical Hebrew refers to the language of the people known in the Old Testament as the Israelites (כְּנָעִי יִשְׂרָאֵל). As exhibited in the Massoretic Text, this language is dated from ca. 1200 to ca. 200 B.C., although Hebrew ceased to be the primary spoken language of the Israelites from about 400 B.C. onwards when it was displaced by Aramaic. Biblical Hebrew is epigraphically represented by several inscriptions and documents other than the MT. It probably was comprised of several dialects and underwent many changes in the one thousand year history of the biblical period. The history, epigraphy, dialects and vicissitudes of Biblical Hebrew are discussed in some detail in Chapter II.

Canaanite: The designation, Canaanite, has come into dispute in recent years particularly as it refers to the languages of the Near East. In this paper Canaanite is used as a collective term for a group of closely-related languages, namely, Amorite, Biblical Hebrew, Ugaritic, Phoenician and Moabite, and for the peoples to whom these were native tongues. While it implies a geographical relationship, it does not necessarily imply close racial affinity.

Semitic: Like the preceding term, Semitic, as used here, implies linguistic rather than racial affinity. It includes a number of closely-related languages of the Near East appearing in inscriptions and documents from early in the fourth millenium B.C. to modern times. These languages include the Akkadian, Canaanite, Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic languages as detailed in Chapter II.

Infix-t Forms: This term includes those verbal forms which are con-

structed by the insertion of the radical t in the stem as the second element of that stem. This will include chiefly the so-called Gt, Nt, Dt and Št stems, as they are designated in Akkadian studies, and the corresponding stems in other Semitic tongues.

Infix-t forms must be distinguished from prefix-t forms such as the Arabic V, VI and IX conjugations and the Hebrew hitpa'el. The latter is prefix-t with doubled second radical (symbolized tD) and is generally regarded as the reflexive of the piel stem. The prefixed h is prosthetic, probably analogous to the h preformative of the hip'il. The preformative h of the hitpa'el is not the same as the preformative h of the hip'il stem. The hip'il corresponds to the Š (causative) stem of Akkadian and Ugaritic, but there is no infix-t (Ht) in Biblical Hebrew to correspond to the Akkadian/Ugaritic Št.

The processes of metathesis and assimilation can also make the recognition of infix-t forms difficult or confusing. Thus, a prefix-t may transpose with a preceding sibilant and appear to be infix-t, or a t radical may double or disappear. The forms of infix-t constructions are discussed in detail in Chapter III.

Other definitions and qualifications of terms are needed in this study, but they are more appropriately given in the text with examples and references where necessary for clarification. Quotations from the Massoretic Text are taken from the ninth edition of Rudolf Kittel's Biblia Hebraica.

Classification of inscriptions and documents for a particular language is in accordance with that of the standard grammar(s) of that language; see page 3. Classification is rather straightforward and

clear with the exception of the Ugaritic texts. In this case, the system devised by Cyrus Gordon and outlined in his Ugaritic Textbook (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965) will be used.

The system of transliteration used here deviates little from that used quite commonly now among Semitic grammarians as found particularly in Sabatino Moscati's Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966). For the purposes of classification, the system is given in the following table.

TABLE 1
SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

Trans- literation	Arabic	Hebrew ¹	Ugaritic ²
ʾ ³	ا	א	ʾa, ʾi, ʾu
b ⁴	ب	ב	b
t	ت	ת	t
ṭ	ط		ṭ
g, j	ج	ג	g
h	ح	ח	h
ḥ	خ		ḥ
d	د	ד	d
ḏ ⁵	ذ		ḏ
r	ر	ר	r
z	ز	ז	z
s	س	ס	s
š	ش	ש	š
ś		שׁ	ś
ṣ	ص	ס	ṣ
ḍ	ض		ḍ
ṭ	ط		ṭ
ẓ	ظ		ẓ

TABLE 1—Continued

Trans- literation	Arabic	Hebrew	Ugaritic
c	ع	y	c
ġ	غ		ġ
p ⁷		פ	p
f	ق		
q	ق	ק	q
k	כ	כ	k
l	ל	ל	l
m	מ	מ	m
n	נ	נ	n
h	ח	ח	h
w	ו	ו	w
y	י	י	y

¹The same letters occur in Aramaic, Phoenician and Moabite.

²We follow Gordon's system of transliteration here (UT, 13-15). and include Ugaritic simply to show the consonants used in that language.

³Three aleph vowel signs occur in Ugaritic.

⁴Spirantization of bgdkpt in Hebrew/Aramaic is a secondary development and not represented here.

⁵Aistleitner represents this letter in Ugaritic s₂, but see UT, 26-27.

⁶Arabic س represents Proto-Semitic š.

⁷Proto-Semitic p has become f in Arabic.

Methodology

It is conceded at the outset that infix-t forms are not a major feature of Biblical Hebrew and that if infix-t forms were ever a feature, they passed from use during the first millennium B.C. Therefore, this

study must be a comparative one, using information gathered from the related Semitic languages in the time period with which we are concerned. This study then, proceeds as follows:

First, it is necessary to establish the position of Biblical Hebrew within the Semitic family of languages. To this end, Chapter II contains a survey of the Semitic languages, historically and grammatically, to give the major point of similarity and difference among the various tongues. The establishment of the close relationship of Biblical Hebrew to its neighboring and contemporary languages will provide the foundation upon which the study may proceed.

Secondly, the occurrence and nature of infix-t forms in each of the languages to which Biblical Hebrew is related will be delineated. The results of this phase of the study will be summarized in Chapter III and will provide the basis from which Biblical Hebrew itself may be considered.

Thirdly, in Chapter IV, previously noted examples of infix-t forms in the Massoretic Text will be examined, and further examples will be sought. Hebrew lexicons will also be searched for possible infix-t forms in verbal and nominal roots. Such possible infix-t forms will be considered from the point of view of their orthography, morphology, etymology and meaning in context. In the final chapter the conclusions of this study will be set forth.

The Scope of the Dissertation

This paper will study the infix-t forms of Biblical Hebrew as these two terms are defined above. It will rely heavily on a study of those Semitic languages in which clear-cut examples of infix-t forms

occur, namely, Akkadian, Amorite, Arabic, Moabite, Phoenician and Ugaritic, i.e., the Near Eastern languages of the second millennium B.C. While the other important Semitic languages, Aramaic, Syriac and Ethiopic, are considered, their inscriptions are generally more recent and have only peripheral value for this study. Likewise, the Hamitic and Hamito-Semitic languages of Africa have been considered and found only peripheral in importance to this dissertation. It is felt that solid conclusions can be drawn only from sure examples of infix-t forms, and thus the main emphasis of the study is put upon them. When necessary or helpful, however, evidence from the "peripheral" languages has been added to give weight to the conclusions drawn, or to note contrary evidence, if pertinent.

Chapter III attempts to be an exhaustive study of infix-t forms in Amorite, Moabite, Phoenician and Ugaritic. In Arabic and Akkadian, however, there are far too many examples of these constructions to list them all. In these two languages only enough examples are given to establish the point or points in question. We employ freely the prodigious and highly respected grammars of Wright (GAL) and von Soden (GAG), as well as other authoritative writings.

Chapter IV attempts to be exhaustive in its search for infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew. It is to be hoped that the conclusions and examples given here will lead others to further research and new insights, and it is thus expected that the list of such forms will be expanded with the passage of time.

Several questions and problems will be raised, with which, it is hoped, others will grapple. One of these is the relationship of

infix-t forms to the hitpa^{cc}el stem of Hebrew and the similar stems in Aramaic and other Semitic languages. It may well be that unrecognized infix-t forms occur in Aramaic as well as in other more recently attested Semitic languages, and a study or studies in this connection should prove fruitful. The Semitic letter t is worthy of a study within itself. It is a most flexible and useful consonant, perhaps the most flexible and useful consonant in the Semitic languages. It is found not only in prefix and infix constructions, but also in the construct state of feminine nouns, the feminine plural, in pronouns and pronominal prefixes and suffixes, and in peculiar instances in individual languages, such as the Akkadian "perfect tense."

The Importance of the Dissertation

Research into the Hebrew language has as its main goal, usually, the clarification of the Hebrew Old Testament and a clearer understanding of its content. If the infix-t stems were a part of the early Biblical Hebrew language, some words, phrases and passages may be given clearer or more correct meaning. Discovery of these forms would help place Biblical Hebrew more accurately within the family of Semitic tongues and could provide a basis for a greater understanding of related languages. Such a study as that undertaken here has recently been called for by the eminent Semiticist, Father Mitchell Dahood. Speaking of the use of infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew, he says,

A monograph study of this question is badly needed, especially since the traditional and erroneous view is repeated in the very recent An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, Phonology and Morphology, ed. Sabatino Mos-

cati, (Wiesbaden, 1964), para. 16.18, p. 127.¹

In personal correspondence, Father Dahood has also stated his interest in the subject and the need for a study of it.

¹Mitchell Dahood, Psalms I, 1-50 (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966), XXXVIII.

CHAPTER II

THE RELATIONSHIP OF BIBLICAL HEBREW TO OTHER SEMITIC LANGUAGES

The Hebrew language is a member of a group of closely related languages to which the designation "Semitic" is generally given. The name is drawn from Genesis 10, from the name of Noah's son, Shem, "the father of all the sons of Eber,"¹ but since its inception it has acquired a much broader content than indicated in the biblical passages, i.e., the term now embraces many more peoples than those listed in the Bible as descendants of Shem. "Semitic" is also used to indicate racial characteristics in accordance with biblical usage, but present knowledge makes clear that the term can be used accurately only to indicate linguistic affinities, not racial connections.² The term "Semitic," however, has gained wide acceptance among linguistic scholars, and is useful as a designation for the group of closely related languages of which Hebrew is one.³

¹The term "Semitic" was first used by A. L. Schlözer in an essay entitled, "Von den Chaldäern," published in 1781. His words are quoted in HGHS, 1, note 1.

²For a different point of view, see Sabatino Moscati, Ancient Semitic Civilizations (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1960), pp. 30-33.

³Henri Fleisch, Introduction à l'étude des Langues sémitiques (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1947), p. 18. See also GVG I, 1; ICGSL, 1.

In the following discussion, it must be held in mind that there are many areas of uncertainty and dispute among scholars regarding the classification and relationship of the Semitic languages. Even so basic a question as the common characteristics of the Semitic language family remains far from settled. E. Ullendorff, in a recent article,¹ calls into question all of those features which scholars had hitherto regarded as distinctive, and makes it obvious that further guide lines must be established. This is, of course, occasioned by the fact that the Semitic languages embrace a wide geographical area, reflect widely different cultural backgrounds and foreign cultural influences, and extend over a very broad span of time, being attested over five thousand years, from early in the third millennium B.C. to the present. All of this is further complicated by a scarcity of documentary evidence, even of Hebrew, which makes it impossible to trace the origins of any given Semitic language from any other attested Semitic language. Still, it is obvious that a close relationship exists among these tongues, particularly those of the pre-Christian era, and it is generally held that all the Semitic languages stem from a common ancestor.² This hypothetical common ancestor is usually designated as "Proto-Semitic."

¹E. Ullendorff, "What Is a Semitic Language?," *Orientalia*, XXVII (1958), 66-75. Ullendorff's conclusions are drawn in large part from the study of the Semitic languages at the extreme end of the spectrum, i.e., the peripheral tongues. What he has to say is true enough for the more recent Arabic and Ethiopic dialects as well as for the Hamitic-Semitic languages of Africa. The traditionally accepted general characteristics of Semitic languages, however, are still quite applicable for the more ancient languages and for the purposes of this study.

²Th. Nöldelke, "Semitic Languages," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 9th edition, XXI, 641. See also Wolf Leslau, "Semitic Languages," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1968, XX, 208.

The classification of the Semitic languages is based primarily upon geographical data rather than upon linguistic similarity. While the latter might be more desirable than the former, as yet no criteria, statistical or otherwise, and no standards have been established to grade the Semitic languages according to degrees of similarity.¹

Accordingly, the geographical area in which Semitic languages have been spoken is broken up into three main districts, as follows:

1. Northeast Semitic: Mesopotamia and environs, of which the sole linguistic representatives are Akkadian and its related dialects.
2. Northwest Semitic: Syria-Palestine and environs, represented linguistically by the Canaanite and Aramaic tongues.
3. Southeast Semitic: Arabia and North Africa, represented by the Arabic and Ethiopic languages.

These groups are further divided and subdivided.

The Northeast Semitic languages are now usually designated broadly by the name "Akkadian." In the past, they have been known variously as Babylonian, Assyrian or Assyro-Babylonian,² but recent writers

¹H. Bauer and P. Leander in HGHS, 8, have attempted to classify the Semitic languages according to their ages. They propose an alte Gruppe consisting of Akkadian and Hebrew, and a jüngere Gruppe which includes Phoenician, Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic. Amorite is seen as a link between the older and younger groups. They have not been generally followed in this.

²Many scholars of the late nineteenth/early twentieth centuries favored the name, Assyrian, e.g., Th. Nöldelke, "Semitic Languages," and F. Delitzsch, Assyrische Grammatik (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1906). It then became common practise to refer to the two main sources of the material and to call it Assyro-Babylonian, thus, H. Bauer and P. Leander, HGHS (Babylonisch-Assyrische) and C. Brockelmann, GVG (Assyrisch-Babylonisch).

have adopted the use of the name of the capital city, Akkad (or Agade), for the first writers of the language.¹ Assyrian and Babylonian dialects are then distinguished as variants of the earlier attested tongue.

Knowledge of the Akkadian language comes to us from a number of archaeological discoveries in the Near East, indeed, not only in Mesopotamia, its original home, but also in Syria-Palestine and Egypt where Akkadian was, for a time, a lingua franca of the Near East. There are several important sites where hundreds and thousands of cuneiform Akkadian tablets have been found. Tell el-Amarna in Egypt reveals about four hundred documents, most of which contain the correspondence of two Kings of Egypt, Amenhopis III and his son, Akhenaten, with their vassals and contemporaries in Syria-Palestine, Mesopotamia and lands to the North. Thousands of cuneiform documents have been found at archaeological digs in Babylon, Nuzi, Mari, Ur, Nimrud, Alalakh, Ugarit and other places. Most of the tablets are concerned with legal, administrative and business matters, but others relate to religious and other affairs. These documents span a large segment of time, being dated from the last half of the third millennium B.C. until early in the Christian era.²

The Akkadians were a group of people who settled in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley shortly after the beginning of the third millennium B.C. The capital city was called Akkad, or Agade, and its greatest ruler in ancient times was Sargon the Great, who is dated in the early twenty-

¹GAG, 2.

²F. F. Bruce, "Tell El-Amarna," Archaeology and Old Testament Study, edited by D. Winton Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 4.

fourth, late twenty-third centuries B.C. The origins of the Akkadians are unknown, but they settled in a land which had already a highly developed culture, the land of the Sumerians, a non-Semitic speaking people whose origins are unknown. The Akkadians adopted many features of Sumerian culture, and among these was the adoption of the Sumerian system of writing. As a result, the Akkadian language shows certain peculiarities which are due to this foreign influence. Other peculiar features arise from the fact that Akkad, Assyria and Babylonia were rather isolated from other Semitic speaking peoples, and thus certain strains in the language developed in peculiar ways.

Linguists now distinguish several dialects of Akkadian, and following von Soden,¹ the presently accepted divisions are as follows:

1. Old Akkadian, ca. 2500-1950 B.C., attested in many Sumerian Texts, king lists and other documents from Babylonia and Mesopotamia.
2. Babylonian
 - a) Old Babylonian, ca. 1950-1530 B.C., known to us through numerous letters and documents from Mesopotamia. The most noteworthy of these is the Law Code of Hammurabi found at Susa.
 - b) Middle Babylonian, ca. 1530-1000 B.C., attested by a relatively small number of monuments, letters and royal inscriptions.
 - c) Late Babylonian (Jüngbabylonische), ca. first half of the first millennium B.C., found in numerous letters and documents.
 - d) New Babylonian, ca. 1000-625 B.C., attested by letters and documents as still a living language toward the final decline of the

¹GAG, 2-4. The dates and descriptions which follow are taken chiefly from this work.

Assyrian empire. New Babylonian became heavily influenced by Aramaic.

e) Later Babylonian (Spätbabylonische), after ca. 625 B.C., was at this time a literary language only, for Aramaic had replaced Babylonian as the spoken language.

3. Assyrian

a) Old Assyrian, ca. 1950-1750 B.C., known through letters and documents from Assyrian colonies in eastern Asia Minor, and through a few royal inscriptions and other texts from Assyria itself.

b) Middle Assyrian, ca. 1500-1000 B.C., attested by laws, royal inscriptions, letters, literary texts and other documents.

c) New Assyrian, ca. 1000-600 B.C., attested by letters, royal inscriptions, literary texts and other documents. At this point it was primarily a literary language and Babylonian was the commonly spoken language of Mesopotamia.

As has already been indicated, the Akkadians borrowed the Sumerian writing system and adapted it to their own language. The original system, however, did not accurately represent all of the Akkadian speech sounds, particularly the gutturals, most of which are therefore missing, at least in the earlier texts. The Sumerian system was syllabic, usually combining a consonant with a vowel, and hundreds of signs were developed to express the various syllables. At first, the writing was pictorial, but later when the wedge-shaped stylus was used, the writing system known now as cuneiform developed. The pictures had already become somewhat abstract before cuneiform writing began, but the use of the stylus led to further abstraction so that most scholars now see little or no resemblance to the original sign.

The Sumero-Akkadian writing system has a number of serious shortcomings (especially from a modern scholar's viewpoint) and leads to numerous difficulties and ambiguities. One of these has already been mentioned, that of the lack of signs for guttural sounds. This system also does not adequately indicate consonant doubling, for it often completely fails to express this important feature of Semitic languages. While the expression of vowels in the Akkadian languages is of immeasurable help to comparative linguistic studies of the Semitic languages, it is not without difficulties, for vowel length is also inadequately and inconsistently expressed. Different scribes may write the same word in different ways, splitting the syllables according to their own understanding and convenience. Most importantly, in addition, is the fact that a given sign may stand for more than one syllabic sound; sometimes for several. A given sign, in addition to one or more syllabic sounds, may also possess a wider connotation, that of the so-called "ideogram." Ideograms express classes of nouns. Thus, šarrum means "king" but may also be used to express the idea of "royalty."¹

Akkadian, in sum, was a spoken language from early in the third millennium B.C. The Tell el-Amarna letters indicate that it was for a time in the second millennium, a lingua franca of the Near East. With the fall of Ninevah in the last part of the seventh century, the language ceased to be spoken but continued as a literary language until the beginning of the Christian era. Akkadian and its various dialects remain the sole representatives of Northeast Semitic, with the exception

¹Excellent descriptions of the difficulties inherent in the Akkadian writing system are found in GAG, 6-10 and GA, 9-12.

of a number of non-Akkadian names which appear in some Old Akkadian and Old Babylonian texts. W. von Soden theorizes that there was another language of the Northeast Semitic genre, dated ca. 2400-1700 B.C., for which he proposed the name "Old Amorite."¹

The second major division of the Semitic languages, again following geographical lines, is Northwest Semitic, which includes the district of Syria-Palestine. Most scholars divide the Northwest Semitic languages into two main groups, Canaanite and Aramaic. There are several distinguishing features of Canaanite and Aramaic. The former usually assimilates ך to a following consonant and retains נ as the sign of the masculine plural. There are also some lexical differences, e.g., בן for "son" in Canaanite, and בר in Aramaic; אני for "I" in the former, אנא in the latter.²

Hebrew, Moabite and Phoenician, including Punic, the language of the Phoenician colonies on the Mediterranean coast are usually classed as Canaanite languages. Closely related to these, if not to be included in the classification of Canaanite languages, are Ugaritic, Amorite (or "East Canaanite" as it is sometimes designated), and the "Canaanite" glosses of the Tell el-Amarna letters. The Aramaic languages are varied, and are generally classed as Old Aramaic, tenth to eighth centuries B.C., Classical (or Imperial Aramaic), seventh to fourth centuries B.C., West Aramaic, from the first century B.C. into the early centuries of the

¹W. von Soden, "Zur Einleitung der semitischen Sprachen," WZKM 56 (1960), 185-191.

²Zelig S. Harris, Development of the Canaanite Dialects (New Haven: The American Oriental Society, 1939), pp. 9-10.

Christian era (with some vestiges still found in the environs of Damascus), and, finally, East Aramaic, beginning in the third century A.D. and ending in the eighth century, although a few traces remain around Lake Urmia in Iran. Biblical Aramaic is usually classified with Classical Aramaic, but there is scarce documentary evidence of Aramaic from the fourth to first centuries B.C.

The Northwest Semitic languages are earliest attested by a number of inscriptions of uncertain date.¹ These include some pseudo-hieroglyphic inscriptions from Byblos,² the so-called Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions,³ and some short inscriptions discovered at Lachish.⁴ All of these are dated in the second millennium B.C. and are not classified as either Canaanite or Aramaic, as they belong to a period before the appearance of Aramaic documents, perhaps before the characteristics which now distinguish Canaanite and Aramaic from each other had developed.⁵

Amorite, as a language, is attested only in proper names in certain Akkadian texts from the First Babylonian Dynasty, especially from the ancient city of Mari, and is found also in the Egyptian execration texts.⁶ Amorite names are distinguished from Akkadian by a number of

¹ICGSL, 8.

²E. Dhorme, "Déchiffrement des inscriptions pseudo-hieroglyphiques de Byblos," Syria, 25 (1946-1948), 1-35.

³W. F. Albright, "The Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from Sinai and Their Decipherment," BASOR 110 (1948), 6-22; A. H. Gardiner, "Once Again the Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions," JEA 48 (1962), 45-48.

⁴T. H. Gaster, "The Archaic Inscriptions," Lachish II, The Fosse Temple (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), 49-57.

⁵ICGSL, 7.

⁶Ibid., 9.

characteristic features. Amorite names use the yagtul imperfect, while Akkadian names use the preterite iprus. Akkadian gutturals are represented only by h and ʾ, while the original ʾ, h, h, h, ʿ, g are retained in Amorite.¹ Semitic roots which were originally š are often s in Amorite and Proto-Semitic w is retained in Akkadian, while it becomes y in Amorite. Lexical differences also occur, e.g., ʾabd, servant, occurs in Amorite but seldom in Akkadian; Amorite ntn, to give, is contrasted with nadannu in Akkadian. Theophorous names are also indicative, for Amorite names frequently contain the name of the goddess Anat who was not a member of the Akkadian pantheon. In many cases, names are specifically categorized as Amorite by the Akkadians themselves who used the ideogram MAR.TU for the designation of the Amorite peoples.² From these proper names Theo Bauer has written a grammar of Amorite, which he called East Canaanite (Ostkanaanäer).³ Difficulties arise, of course, because of the very limited nature of documentary evidence for this language, but the discovery and interpretation of Amorite names has proved a valuable source of information in the study of Semitic languages.

¹In cuneiform, most of the gutturals are represented by h, since no signs were developed until later to designate the different guttural sounds of the Semitic languages. Thus, as pointed out by Herbert B. Huffmon in his Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 14, the West Semitic baʿl would be written bel in Akkadian, but ba-(ah)-lu in an Amorite name.

²Huffmon, Amorite Personal Names, pp. 13-17.

³Theo Bauer, Die Ostkanaanäer (Leipzig: Im Verlag der Asia Major, 1926), pp. 62-70. See also Giorgio Buccelati, The Amorites of the UR III Period (Naples: Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1966), pp. 187-213.

Of greater importance has been the discovery of Ugaritic during archaeological work undertaken at Ras Shamra in Syria by C. F. S. Shaeffer. A large number of cuneiform tablets were uncovered which were soon found to be alphabetic in character, rather than syllabic. Earliest decipherments were made by Ch. Virolleand, H. Bauer, and E. Dhorme, and while the translations of the texts have cast much light upon the understanding of the Old Testament, their value for the Semitic languages is not less.

Ugaritic has already revolutionized the study of the Old Testament, although the 'mopping-up operations' will continue for many years to come, with rich results, in general and in detail. The full impact of Ugaritic on Semitic linguistics, on the one hand, and Near East cultural history, on the other, is yet to be felt. As the evidence now stands, the most important change in the status of Semitics since Brockelmann's *Grundriss* is the addition of Ugaritic to the repertoire of the Semitic languages. This will sooner or later necessitate the revision of nearly every section of the *Grundriss*.¹

Ugaritic is written in consonants only, except that different cuneiform signs exist for each aleph-vowel combination, i.e., aleph-a, aleph-i, and aleph-u. Standing as it does, in the fourteenth-thirteenth centuries B.C., many of its grammatical forms bring new knowledge to the study of the Hebrew language of the Old Testament, written several centuries later. The language of Ugarit has cleared up many obscurities of Hebrew and has corrected many erroneous assumptions, interpretations, and translations.²

The classification of Ugaritic remains unsettled. Some scholars

¹ *UT*, 1-2.

² M. Dahood, *Psalms I* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1967), pp. xv-xx. *UT*, 1-2.

would place it with the Canaanite language group,¹ while others would not classify it among the Northwest Semitic languages at all, preferring to connect it with the Northeastern tongues.² Most Semitic linguists, however, would hold that it is a member of the Northwest Semitic group, related to the precursor of Moabite, Hebrew, and Phoenician.

There exist, among the Tell el-Amarna letters, a number of glosses which are not Akkadian in nature and which have definite affinities to Northwest Semitic. These so-called "Canaanite" glosses appear also in the Akkadian texts of Ugarit and in some Egyptian documents. They are dated in the fourteenth-thirteenth centuries B.C.³

Of more importance to the present study is the Moabite language, classified among the Canaanite languages, found on the so-called Mesha Stone and in two smaller inscriptions. The Mesha, or Moabite, Stone⁴ consists of about thirty-four lines of Paleo-Hebrew script, relating the claim of the King of Moab that the Israelites had been utterly crushed. It is dated in the ninth century B.C. The other inscriptions are short and fragmentary in nature and dated in the same century, although they may be a decade or two older than the Mesha inscription.⁵

¹M. Dahood, "The Linguistic Position of Ugaritic in the Light of Recent Discoveries," *Sacra Pagina*, I, edited by J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and E. Massaux (Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1959), 267-279.

²See *UT*, 144-148 and the references cited there.

³J. A. Knudston, *Die Tell-El-Amarna Tafeln*, Vol. 2 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1915), pp. 1545-1549.

⁴G. A. Cooke, *A Text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1903), pp. 1-14.

⁵W. Reed and F. Winnett, "A Fragment of an Early Moabite Inscription from Kerak," *BASOR* 172 (December, 1963), 1-9; D. N. Freedman,

While Moabite has many close similarities to Biblical Hebrew, there appear to be enough differences on the basis of meager evidence to classify it as a separate language. Moabite, for example, forms the feminine singular with *t* and the dual and plural with *n* (it differs from all the rest of the Canaanite languages in this latter respect), and does not use the definite article with the demonstrative pronoun, 𐤌𐤊𐤍 𐤌𐤊𐤍 . The word 𐤌𐤊𐤍 is used instead of the Hebrew הַזֶּה , etc.

Also grouped with the Canaanite tongues is the Phoenician language, together with the language of its Mediterranean colonies, called Punic.¹ The inscriptions date during the entire span of the first millennium B.C. with some Punic documents extending into the second century of the Christian era. The alphabetic script of Phoenicia was borrowed by the Moabites and Hebrews and was also used elsewhere in the Near East; indeed, this system of writing forms the basis of all known alphabetic writing. Phoenician was written, like most Semitic languages, in a purely consonantal script, but transcriptions of Phoenician words and names in Greek and Latin aid in the reconstruction of its vocalic pronunciations. Like Moabite, the Phoenician language is very closely allied to Biblical Hebrew, with yet enough distinctive features to allow it to be classified as a separate language. Most notable, perhaps, of the differences between Phoenician and Hebrew is the shift from Proto-Semitic *ā*

"A Second Mesha Inscription," *BASOR* 175 (October, 1964), 50-51; R. E. Murphy, "A Fragment of an Early Moabite Inscription from Dibon," *BASOR* 125 (February, 1952), 20-23.

¹Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1936); Johannes Friedrich, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1951).

to 5 in Hebrew. The ā is retained in Phoenician.¹

Biblical Hebrew is also listed by most scholars among the Canaanite languages. The documents of the Old Testament are dated between 1200 and 200 B.C., and some extra-biblical inscriptions are also found during this period. The most famous of these, perhaps, are the Gezer Calendar,² of the tenth century, and the Siloam Inscription,³ dated in the time of King Hezekiah, late eighth or early seventh century, but many others also illuminate the Hebrew of the biblical period, e.g., the letter of Yavneh-Yam,⁴ the ostraca of Samaria,⁵ Lachish,⁶ and Arad,⁷ among others.⁸

The largest single body of Biblical Hebrew, however, is found in the Bible itself, most clearly represented by the Massoretic Text.

¹See GPL, pp. 67-70 for the differences between Phoenician and the other Canaanite languages.

²W. F. Albright, "The Gezer Calendar," BASOR 92 (December, 1943), 16-26.

³G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, I (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1908), pp. 95-96.

⁴J. Naveh, "A Hebrew Letter from the Seventh Century B.C.," Israel Exploration Journal, 10 (1960), 129-139. See also, Frank M. Cross, Jr., "Epigraphic Notes on Hebrew Documents of the Eighth-Sixth Centuries B.C. II. The Murabba'at Papyrus and the Letter Found Near Yavneh-Yam," BASOR, 165 (February, 1962), 34-46.

⁵G. A. Reisner, C. S. Fisher, and D. G. Lyon, Harvard Excavations at Samaria, I, Text (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924), pp. 227-246.

⁶H. Torczyner, Lachish I: The Lachish Letters (London: Oxford University Press, 1938).

⁷Yohanan Aharoni, "Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple," Biblical Archaeologist, XXXI (February, 1968), 2-32.

⁸For further information on early Hebrew inscriptions see Frank M. Cross, Jr., and David N. Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1952), pp. 45-60.

The Massoretes, however, reflect, for the most part, Hebrew forms and pronunciations as they existed in the latter half of the first millennium A.D. when Hebrew was used mainly as the sacred language of writ and ritual, with all the rigidity that that implies. On the other hand, the faithfulness with which these scribes transmitted some ancient names, grammatical constructions and word forms give us some insight into Biblical Hebrew as it existed in the various time periods between 1200 and 200 B.C. Thus, we still find the ancient personal pronominal form ָאָתָּךְ for ָאָתָּךְ the second person feminine plural, instead of the more common ָאָתָּךְ , ָאָתָּךְ (Ju. 17:2; I K. 14:2; II K. 4:16, 28; 8:1; Jer. 4:30; Ezek. 36:13); ָאָתָּךְ , instead of ָאָתָּךְ (Gen. 31:6; Ezek. 13:11, 20; 34:17) for the second person feminine plural; ָאָתָּךְ and ָאָתָּךְ instead of ָאָתָּךְ and ָאָתָּךְ respectively for the third person plural, masculine and feminine. We find probable traces of mimation, e.g., dārōm, "south" and hārōm, "magician." Some adverbial forms of Biblical Hebrew evidence this same phenomenon.¹

We may be reasonably certain that Biblical Hebrew was comprised of several dialects, with linguistic differences most marked between the northern and southern kingdoms. The Bible itself indicates one such difference when it recalls the fact that the Ephaimites could not properly pronounce ָשׁ , the famous "shibboleth incident" of Ju. 12:6. The Samaria ostraca and the so-called Elohist (northern) Psalms, Ps. 42-83, add some evidence in this respect.

The origins of Biblical Hebrew are obscure. The biblical

¹See ICGSL, 98.

²Stanislav Segert, "Die Sprache der moabitischen Königsinschrift," ArOr 29 (1961), 250-259.

tradition would indicate Aramaean roots (Dt. 26:5, "A wandering Aramaean was my father . . .") which, according to some, would explain the similarities between Hebrew and Aramaic.¹ This, however, seems unlikely, and most grammarians would only go so far as to state that Hebrew and Aramaic stem from a common, though distant, ancestor, called Proto-Semitic.

In any case, Hebrew was the spoken tongue of the Israelite people from ca. 1200 until approximately 400 B.C. when it was replaced, as were many other Semitic languages, by Aramaic. Hebrew has remained the sacred language of Israelite/Jewish religion, however, until the present time. It is once again a living tongue, having been revived as the national and official language of the modern state of Israel. In the intervening years, Hebrew underwent a long period of transmission as a written language, and during that time it was influenced by other languages. Scholars distinguish Mishnaic Hebrew, heavily influenced by Aramaic, Medieval and Modern Hebrew from Classical or Biblical Hebrew, each period showing its own peculiar characteristics.

The second branch of the Northwest Semitic group is that of the Aramaic languages, spoken in the lands east of Canaan from pre-biblical times, with remnants existing today. In its earliest stages, Aramaic (known generally as Old Aramaic) is attested by inscriptions found in Syria, at Hamah and Zinjirli, dated in the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. Old Aramaic was spoken by the Aramaeans who conquered and controlled Syria-Palestine, North Arabia and part of Mesopotamia. Cuneiform

¹ Arthur Jeffrey, "Hebrew Language," IDE, E-J, 553-554.

letters refer to them as the Ahlame or Ahlami Armaya. In the seventh to fourth centuries B.C., Aramaic became a lingua franca of the Near East. In this period it is referred to by scholars as Classical or Imperial Aramaic, while the Aramaic of Ezra and Daniel, known as Biblical Aramaic, is dated from the fifth to the second centuries B.C. The latter reflects the time when Aramaic had replaced Hebrew as the spoken tongue of Palestine, even though Hebrew continued to be the sacred language of worship and writing. During the same period, Classical Aramaic was the generally accepted written language of correspondence among nations of the area.

From the beginning of the Christian era, the Aramaic languages are divided into two groups, those languages spoken in the West (Syria-Palestine) and those spoken in the East (East of the Jordan to Mesopotamia). The West Aramaic languages are Nabataean (first century B.C. to third century A.D.); Palmyrene (first century B.C. to third century A.D.); Jewish-Palestinian Aramaic (first century B.C. to fifth century A.D.); Samaritan Aramaic (fourth century A.D.), and Christian Palestinian Aramaic (fifth to eighth centuries A.D.). East Aramaic is composed of Syriac (third to thirteenth centuries A.D.); Babylonian Aramaic (fourth to sixth centuries A.D.), and Mandaean (third to eighth centuries A.D.). The Aramaic languages were generally replaced by Arabic which swept over the land with the faith of Muhammad in the eighth century A.D., but traces of it remain today around Lake Urmia and outside Damascus.

The third major division of the Semitic languages is that of the Southwest, including the Arabic and Ethiopic dialects. Arabic is

divided by most Semitists into North and South Arabic, and since the oldest inscriptions belong to the southern grouping, it will be discussed first.

Epigraphic South Arabian (ESA), sometimes called Ḥimyarite after the Ḥimyar tribe of the district, is attested by several thousand stone inscriptions, dated in some cases to the early part of the first millenium B.C. The major dialects of this group are Sabaeen and Minaean, but Qatabanian, Ḥadramī and Awsanian, though less frequently found, are related dialects. The Sabaeen and Minaean texts are considered the oldest of the group, dating from 800 or 700 B.C., continuing until the second century before our era.¹ There exists a group of languages in South Arabic spoken in modern times whose relationship to Epigraphic South Arabian is unclear. Grouped under the heading of "Modern South Arabic" they include Maḥri, Ṣḥaurī, Soqoṭri, Botahari and Harsusi.

In the North, the Arabic languages are classified according to the date of the Quran, the language of which is the standard and is thus called "Classical Arabic." Pre-classical North Arabic is attested by inscriptions, generally dated from the fifth century B.C. to the fourth century A.D., discovered at el-ʿOla and Damascus. Three dialects are differentiated: Thamūdīc, Liḥyānite and Ṣafāitīc. The material is meager. The alphabet used in these inscriptions is derived from that of South Arabic, i.e., the Minaean and Sabaeen dialects, but the language is clearly the precursor of Classical Arabic.

The Arabic of the Quran is termed Classical Arabic because it, as the sacred language of Muhammad's revelations, became standard

¹Fleisch, Introduction, p. 92.

throughout the Moslem world after the advent of the prophet of Allah. A few inscriptions of Classical Arabic nature, pre-dating the Quran, have been discovered, and it is generally recognized that a rich, oral body of Arabic poetry preceded the sacred writings of the Prophet. According to Moscati, "the generally attested form of Classical Arabic is the result of a process of systematization by Arab grammarians,"¹ the whole process not dissimilar from the effects of Luther's German translation of the Bible upon the disunified dialects of medieval Germany. In modern times, there are a great many Arabic dialects spoken in the Moslem world, while, however, the Arabic of the Quran continues as the sacred standard.

The final Semitic language to be discussed here, is the language of Ethiopia, dating back early in the Christian era. The native language of the Abyssinian peninsula had been Cushitic until immigrants from Yemen brought their peculiar type of Arabic into this area. Thus Ethiopic is generally classed with the Arabic languages, even though it contains many elements from non-Semitic tongues.

Ancient Ethiopic is usually termed Geez after the tribes who spoke it. It has now become a sacred language and is no longer spoken except in religious liturgy and worship. Modern dialects exist, namely Tigriña, Tigre, Amharic, Harari and Gurage. Other vestiges also exist, but among peoples whose numbers are extremely small.

As the foregoing has indicated, the languages classified as Semitic have had a long and varied history. Many have known relatively

¹ICGSL, 14.

short periods of life as living languages, while others have continued for many centuries both as spoken and literary languages. In spite of their divergencies in geographical area and span of time, there is an underlying basis of similarity which cannot be disregarded in any study based on a comparison of one Semitic tongue with another. The relatively close relationship of the languages of the Near East here discussed forms a good foundation, to be sure not always without question or problem, from which evidence can be weighed and conclusions drawn. Semitists, long recognizing this fact, have labored to determine the features of the common ancestor of this language family.¹ Many books, articles and discussions have led to the emergence of wide areas of agreement among scholars concerning the phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicography of Proto-Semitic. Research has been further refined so that one frequently finds references to Proto-Northwest Semitic and Proto-Canaanite. Some of the conclusions drawn by scholars in these fields will be referred to below.

The important features for the sake of comparison of the Semitic languages will be discussed under the following four headings: phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicography.

1. Phonology

a) Consonants. According to S. Moscati, the Proto-Semitic consonants are the following:²

Bilabials: p b m

¹See particularly G. Bergsträsser, Einführung in die semitischen Sprache (München: Max Hueber, 1928).

²ICGSL, 24.

Interdentals: $\text{t} \text{ d } \text{t} \text{ d}$

Dentals: $\text{t} \text{ d } \text{t} \text{ s } \text{z} \text{ s} \text{ l} \text{ s} \text{ r} \text{ n}$

Palato-alveolar: š

Velars: $\text{k} \text{ q} \text{ g} \text{ ħ} \text{ ġ}$

Pharyngeals: ħ^c

Laryngeals: $\text{ʕ} \text{ h}$

There are some difficulties with the above, particularly with the interdental d which some think may have been a lateralized dental.¹ Basically, however, scholars are in agreement with the consonantal list given above. One should note especially the large number of gutturals (k , q , g , ħ , ġ) and sibilants (s , z , š , ś , š).

The above-listed consonants are found for the most part in all the Semitic languages under discussion here. As is to be expected, there is generally greater coincidence with Proto-Semitic among the older languages, although no Semitic language, ancient or modern, agrees completely with the above list. Arabic retains the greatest number of the original Proto-Semitic consonants, but it shows some variations, e.g., the loss of š and the conversion, in common with the entire South Semitic branch, of p to f . Hebrew retains all except the interdentals t , d , t and d , and the velars ħ and ġ .

Several of the languages have added consonants or consonantal variations. Thus, in Ethiopic where Proto-Semitic p has become f , p and q have been secondarily developed, probably under the influence of Greek, for the new consonants are found largely in translations of Greek words. In Hebrew (and in Aramaic) there is a tendency to spirantize the

¹Wolf Leslau, "Semitic Languages."

BeGaDeKePaT letters after vowels: b > v, g > gh, d > dh, k > ch, p > f, and t > th. This is a secondary development, also, and spirantized d and t are not related to Proto-Semitic d and t, respectively.

There are two other consonants, often called half-vowels, for while they were probably originally purely consonantal in character, they later became signs for vowels. These are w and y. Hebrew shows the character of these letters in words like yld (Proto-Semitic wld) = "boy," where the y (or w) is entirely consonantal, and in gwm = "to rise," where the w is a vowel. Other Semitic languages show this peculiarity also.

It is rather common for given languages to make certain predictable phonemic shifts. Thus, Proto-Semitic ṭ becomes ṣ in Hebrew, a shift already noticeable in Ugaritic no later than the thirteenth century B.C.¹ Likewise ḡ becomes z. As has already been noted, p of Proto-Semitic becomes f in the Southern languages, Arabic, Ethiopic and Epigraphic South Arabian. Aramaic shows shifts from ḡ to d, ṭ to t and ḥ to c.²

b) Vowels. Proto-Semitic vowels were a, i, u, both long and short, similar to those of Arabic.³ The various dialects and languages have added their own variations. Thus Akkadian adds e and ē; Hebrew, and oc-

¹Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "The Canaanite Cuneiform Tablet from Taanach," BASOR, 190 (April, 1968), p. 42, n. 5.

²Several grammars list regular consonantal shifts in the various Semitic languages. See UT, 30; H. Neil Richardson, A Practical Handbook for the Study of Biblical Aramaic (Boston: Boston University Bookstores, 1965), p. 6. See also the excellent synopsis of consonantal changes in ICGSL, 43-45. The latter suffers somewhat by its exclusion of some languages, especially the older dialects of Aramaic.

³ICGSL, 47.

casionaly Aramaic, shift long $\bar{a}$ to $\bar{o}$. The Hebrew of the Masoretic text shows the greatest variation in vowel inflection. The inventors of the Tiberian pointing system have indicated all gradations from no vowel at all (*sewa*), to murmured vowels "a," to both short and long vowel phonemes. It must be remembered, however, that the Massoretes represented a traditional pronunciation in use by a particular group of Jews after Hebrew had ceased to be a commonly spoken language, and therefore their pointing system must be employed cautiously in research.

The diphthongs *aw* and *ay* occur in the Semitic languages. They are preserved in Classical Arabic, but the other languages frequently change them, usually by reducing them to single long vowels (Hebrew yawm > yōm), but occasionally by adding a vowel between the half-vowel and a following full consonant (mawt > mawet), probably as the result of anaptyxis.¹

c) Phonetic Changes. Certain fairly regular phonetic changes occur in the languages under discussion here. The changes most important for this study are summarized as follows:

(1) Assimilation: Assimilation of adjacent consonants, particularly *n* and *l*, occurs in most Semitic languages, e.g., Hebrew: yntn > ytn = "he gives"; ylqh > yqgh = "he takes"; Aramaic: ynpl > yppl = "he falls"; Akkadian: intadin > ittadin = "he gave"; Arabic: ittalaba > ittalaba = "he sought"; Ugaritic: ylqh > yqh (yqgh) = "he takes"; ynpl > ypl (yppl) = "he falls"; Phoenician: ynt > st = "year" (but plural šnt, vocalized šanōt); Moabite also shows st for šnt. Assimilation also occurs

¹Ibid., 54-55.

in Arabic in the combination of the definite article, ^ʾal, with the "sun" letters: t, ṭ, d, ḍ, r, z, s, ṣ, ṣ, ṣ̣, ḍ, ḍ̣, ṭ, ṭ̣, ḏ, l and n, which begin the word, e.g., ʾal-raḥulu = "the man," pronounced ʾarḥajulu even though the l is still represented orthographically, الرجل. The same phenomenon may occur between vowels (vowel harmony), e.g., Akkadian epāšum > epēšum = "to make"; and between vowels and consonants, e.g., Hebrew yišlōh > yišlāh = "he sends."¹

(2) Dissimilation: The occurrence of dissimilation is somewhat less frequent than assimilation, but nonetheless it frequently occurs: Hebrew, lun = "to spend the night," from the same root as laylh = "night"; Akkadian, inaddin > inandin = "he gives"; Arabic, šms = "sun," from Proto-Semitic šmš; Aramaic, tidda > tinda = "she knows" (manda = "knowledge"); Phoenician, possibly, bmskb for mmskb = "from the bed";² Ugaritic, ṣṭqn (a personal name) from the root ṣdq.³

(3) Anaptyxis: In Semitic words, where adjacent consonants cannot occur at the end of the word, a vowel is often inserted to create a new syllable: Hebrew, ʾebed < ʾabd (note form with suffix ʾabdiy) = "servant"; Akkadian, kalb > kalab = "dog"; Phoenician (Punic qabr > qab^ʿar = "grave" (Punic frequently adds ^ʿ to graphically represent the anaptyctic vowel); Aramaic, milah from Proto-Semitic milh. Moscati points out that anaptyxis is rare in Arabic, since vowels appear at the ends of words in case

¹See GVG, 151-219; ICGSL, 56-58.

²But Ugaritic has shown the difficulty of translating the preposition b. It can mean either in(to) or from. See UT, 92-95.

³GVG, 219-259; ICGSL, 58-59.

endings and prevent the appearance of adjacent consonants in final position. The lack of vowels in Ugaritic orthography makes identification of this phenomenon uncertain.¹

(4) Prosthesis: Analogous to anaptyxis discussed above, prosthesis prevents the occurrence of adjacent consonants at the beginning of a word by the addition of a vowel, usually attached to the glottal stop, ^ʔ: Arabic VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, etc., forms add a prosthetic ^ʔalif due to stress shifts and added syllables which leave the first consonant vowelless; Hebrew, zroa ^ʔ> ezroā ^ʔ or z^ʔroā ^ʔ = "arm"; Phoenician, z ^ʔ> z^ʔ = "this."²

(5) Syncope: Consonant and vowel contraction and loss is not infrequent in the Semitic languages, particularly of the "weak" consonants ^ʔ, w, y and h: Hebrew ciy ^ʔ< awiy = "ruins"; Akkadian, rēšu ^ʔ< Proto-Semitic r^ʔš = "head"; Arabic, gār ^ʔ< gawir = "sojourner"; Phoenician, ra ^ʔ< rāš = "head" (although the ^ʔalef is still orthographically represented, 𐤒𐤍).³

(6) Haplology: The disappearance of one or two identical adjacent syllables is rather frequent in the languages under discussion here: Arabic, yaqtulūnanā ^ʔ> yaqtulūnā = "you fight"; Aramaic, ma^ʔnayayyā ^ʔ> ma^ʔnayyā = "vessels"; Syriac, aryayā ^ʔ> aryā = "lion"; Hebrew im m^ʔma^ʔen ^ʔ> imma^ʔen = "if he refuses" (Ex. 7:27; 9:2, etc. The form is the pi^ʔel active participle).⁴

(7) Metathesis: Of special importance to this paper is consonant inversion, or metathesis, because it so frequently involves the consonant t. Many other letters are also affected by this phenomenon which occurs in all the Semitic languages: Akkadian, dipšu ^ʔ> dišpu = "honey"; Hebrew,

¹ICGSL, 60-61. ²Ibid., 59-60.

³Ibid., 61-62. ⁴GVG, 259-267; ICGSL, 62-63.

šimlā > šalmā = "coat"; Arabic, mal'ak > ma'lak = "messenger"; Syriac, galmā < (cf. Arabic) gaml = "vermin."

In verbal forms metathesis often takes place when t and a dental or palato-velar fricative are adjacent. There are many examples: Hebrew hitpa'el verbs, hiššammer > hištammer = "he guarded (himself)"; hišsatter > hištatter = "he hid (himself)"; Akkadian, šitbutum > tišbutum = "to bind one another"; Aramaic hitpa'al and hitp'el verbs, mištakkal < mitsakkal = "observing"; hiš'kah < hiš'kah = "he was found." A reverse metathesis occurs in Akkadian when an infix t would normally follow z, s, š, and occasionally š or d, e.g., šitbutu > tišbutu = "to grasp."¹

Long recognized, but still far from being well understood, are the changes caused by stress or accent in words and sentences. Thanks to Massoretic pointing, the stress patterns of Biblical Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic can be distinguished and, likewise, Arabic and Syriac stress patterns are fairly well known. Stress in Akkadian and other ancient languages is a matter of conjecture and uncertainty.²

2. Morphology

a) Verbal System. There is considerable similarity among the verbal systems of the various Semitic languages. This is more pronounced among the more ancient tongues than among the more recent ones, for the latter have diverged as the result of time and foreign influence and other factors. Biblical Hebrew and other Semitic verbs usually consist of three

¹GVG, 267-278; ICGSL, 63.

²Ibid., 65-70.

"root" consonants,¹ interspaced with vowels. Gender, person, number, voice, mood, states of being and action are expressed by the addition of prefixes and suffixes. Semitic verbs do not usually express time (i.e., tense) but rather the completeness or incompleteness of the action. They may also express states of being. Completed action is shown by the suffixing of pronominal elements to the root (the perfect "tense"); incomplete action is portrayed by the prefixing of pronominal elements (the imperfect "tense"). It is now common practice to indicate the former as the "suffix conjugation" and the latter as the "prefix conjugation."

The Akkadian dialects have developed in a special way. They have a prefix conjugation (iparras) which expresses incomplete action, but completed action is expressed by the prefix conjugation with internal vowel changes (iprus). The former is called the "present" and the latter the "preterite" by von Soden.² In addition Akkadian has a "perfect" which is formed with an infixed-t (iptaras) and a stative, con-

¹Several biradical and quadrilateral roots exist. Some speculate that early Proto-Semitic contained nothing but biradical roots and that the most primitive forms may have been uniradical in nature. According to this theory, the second and third radicals were added over a period of time until the vast majority of verbs were triradical. Many of the biradical roots which remained became "pseudo-triradical" by the addition of semi-vowels and the doubling of root consonants aping the more common triradical form; thus qm > qwm; sb > sbb. On this point see G. R. Driver, Problems, pp. 1-8. Although they are rather distantly related, several languages of North Africa add to the evidence for original biconsonantal roots, since their normal verb root is consonant-vowel-consonant, very similar to the Hebrew qwm, sym, etc. See the discussion in G. R. Castellino, The Akkadian Personal Pronouns and Verbal System in the Light of Semitic and Hamitic. (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1962), pp. 44-45.

²GAG, 102-103.

jugated with suffixes (paris). The infix t perfect is somewhat disputed, but it seems to express action completed but with continuing effects, similar to the Greek perfect tense. Regardless of the Akkadian peculiarities of form, the verbal system agrees with the verbal system of the Semitic family in that it treats not of time but of the state of the action.

To the basic root, certain prefixed, suffixed and infix elements form different verbal "stems" which express different aspects of verbal action. The simple, or Ground (G) stem indicates simple action; factitive and intensive action is expressed by doubling the second root letter, the so-called D stem.¹ The addition of a prefixed n expresses the passive voice, the N stem and causative force is shown by the prefixing of š, the Š stem, as follows:

<u>Stem</u>	<u>Suffix Conjugation</u>	<u>Translation</u>
G	qbr	he buried
D	qbbr	he buried (many people)
N	nqbr	he was buried
Š	sqbr	he caused to be buried

<u>Stem</u>	<u>Prefix Conjugation</u>	<u>Translation</u>
G	yqbr	he buries
D	yqbbr	he buries (many people)
N	yqqbr	he is buried

¹On the meanings of the pi'el, see ICGSL, 124.

√
S.

yšqbr

he causes to
be buried

There are many variations on the above theme. Hebrew forms its causative stem by the affix h instead of š; Aramaic uses h and ʔ. Arabic has several additional stems as do Ugaritic, Hebrew and Aramaic. Akkadian, Arabic, Moabite, Phoenician, Amorite and Ugaritic certainly form additional stems by infixing t after the first radical of the stem. In some cases, t may be prefixed, e.g., Arabic V and VI forms. In some cases, too, vowels are lengthened to indicate other verbal themes, e.g., Arabic III form, katāba (from I: kataba), indicating reciprocal action, "he corresponded."

The Semitic verbs share another peculiarity. While all the members of the language family have an imperative form, used in commands, etc., the imperative is not used in prohibitions. Prohibitions are usually expressed by use of the prefix conjugation, the imperfect or jussive, together with the word for "no" or "not." Thus in Akkadian one finds lā tanaddin = "do not give,"¹ in Hebrew, lō tignōb = "you shall not steal,"² in Aramaic al yištannō = "let them not be changed." In Ethiopic, prohibitions are expressed by the use of the negative with the subjunctive;³ in Arabic la with the jussive;⁴ in Ugaritic, the negative with yagtul,⁵ etc.

The foregoing survey of the Semitic verbal system is necessarily brief, but it is a scheme into which the Biblical Hebrew verb fits quite

¹Ibid., 105.

²GHG, 317.

³EG, 518.

⁴GAL, I, 43-44.

⁵UT, 72.

well. To be sure, Biblical Hebrew has its own peculiarities and its own personality, but its very close relationship to the verbal systems of the other ancient Semitic languages is undeniable.

b) Nouns. Nominal forms of Biblical Hebrew have many similarities to those of the other Semitic languages. There are two genders and three numbers, although the dual is vestigial in some of the languages, including Biblical Hebrew. Akkadian, Arabic and Ugaritic retain Proto-Semitic case endings, but in Biblical Hebrew only traces remain. In most of the other languages, case endings have completely disappeared. Genitiwal relationships are shown by pronominal suffixes or by a type of word compounding, the so-called construct-absolute relationship, where the object and its possessor are so closely allied that the two words act as one. Other compounding of words is virtually unknown.¹

The Semitic languages share a peculiarity in the agreement of certain cardinal numbers with the nouns they limit. Thus, the numbers three through ten take the feminine form with masculine nouns and vice-versa. This occurs in all the Semitic dialects here considered insofar as they are attested.²

3. Syntax

Semitic sentences are generally simple in structure, often joined together in a run-on manner by the copulative "waw."³ There

¹Another possible example is the use of the maqqeph in the Massoretic text. Words thus joined are accented as though they were one word. There is no discernible consistency in the Massoretic text, however, with regard to the use of the maqqeph.

²See Moscati's table in ICGSL, page 116. To that table may be added Aramaic (t'lātāh, etc.) and Phoenician (ālāh, etc.).

³The so-called "waw consecutive" (or "conversive") is peculiar

are comparatively few particles, and compound sentences with subordinated or dependent clauses are infrequent except in Classical Arabic and Syriac. Adjectives generally agree in gender, number and where indicated, case. Generalities regarding word order are difficult to make, for there seems to be no basic rule for the Semitic languages. In Biblical Hebrew, the verb more often than not precedes the subject: verb-subject-object, but subject-verb-object order is frequent. The same is true in Ugaritic and Akkadian. In Aramaic, preference is shown for object-verb-subject, although other combinations occur. Arabic nominal and verbal sentences, named for the element which comes first in the sentence, are rather rigidly used to express description (the former) and an act or event (the latter).¹ But in Arabic, as in all the Semitic languages, the desire to accent or emphasize can lead to wide variance in word order.

4. Lexicography

Finally, the great similarity among the various words of the Semitic languages must be noted. There is a large number of word roots common to all the tongues, subject, of course, to the regular phonetic changes and vowel patterns characteristic of each language.

In the preceding there has been no attempt to be exhaustive, but enough has been offered, I believe, to show the very close relationship that exists among the Semitic family of languages. Hebrew stands within the Canaanite branch of Northwest Semitic and has its closest affinity

to Biblical Hebrew and Moabite, although Ugaritic has a few clear cases of this phenomenon, see UT, 115.

¹GAL, II, 250-255.

to the other Canaanite tongues, namely, Phoenician, Moabite, and Amorite. It shows only relatively little more variation when compared with the older evidences of the Aramaic dialects, and even though separated by greater geographic distance from Akkadian, its affinity to those dialects is still remarkable. Even the languages separated from Hebrew by centuries, for example, Ethiopic, are not without considerable value in reconstruction of the ancient tongue of the Hebrew people. Arabic, also, is a valuable aid in this respect. Generally regarded as the tongue that has changed least among the Semitic group, Arabic illuminates much concerning Proto-Semitic and much that would otherwise be obscure in Hebrew. In the following study, evidence will be gathered from the Semitic family, including Hebrew itself, and inferences drawn from this to determine the occurrence of infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew.

CHAPTER III

SURVEY OF INFIX-T FORMS

Before proceeding to a study of infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew, it is necessary to examine their occurrence in related Semitic languages. In the following, the point of view of several well-known comparative grammars is outlined and then the individual languages are discussed with regard to the appearance of infix-t forms within each of them. This part of the study progresses from Akkadian and Arabic where the forms are numerous and complex, to Ugaritic with its moderate frequency of occurrence, to Amorite, Moabite and Phoenician where only a few forms are known. A brief discussion of t-forms in Aramaic and Ethiopic will follow, and the chapter ends with generalizations and conclusions drawn from this part of the study.

The first systematic treatise of comparative Semitic grammar was William Wright's Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (Cambridge: The University Press, 1890), and while new materials have added greatly to our knowledge of this field, the book still offers much of value to the student. The author considers all infix-t forms the result of metathesis, the transposition of a prefix "ta" with the first root consonant of the verb.

The Arabic form *تَفْعِلُ*, standing for *تَفْعِلُ*, offers us the curious feature of a transposition of the preformative to the place after the first radical *تَفْعِلُ* for *تَفْعِلُ*. . . . Curiously enough the same transposition seems to have existed in Moabitic; at least in the inscription of king Mesha¹ we

find four times (ll. 11, 15, 19, 32) a form הלתחם, from the rad. לחם, in the sense of the Heb. לחם "fight," . . . It is also found in Assyrian, as istakan "he made," iftikid "he committed" or "entrusted," and the Himyaritic, without any prosthetic alif, e.g. סחטר from סטר, סחאל from סאל, נדרר from נדר.¹

Wright believes this metathesis began with the transposition of t with a sibilant and gradually spread throughout the verbal system. The t was also prefixed to the intensive (tagattala), passive (tagatala), and causative (istagtala). For Wright, the addition of t in prefixed or "infix" position gives, usually, reflexive meaning to the verb, but occasionally imparts reciprocal or passive meaning to it.²

The second, and perhaps still the greatest work in the field of comparative Semitics, was the publication in 1908 of Carl Brockelmann's Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprache.³ In his discussion of the t-stems, Brockelmann, like Wright, attributes infix-t constructions to metathesis, "wahrscheinlich nach Analogie der zahlreichen mit Zischlauten beginnenden Verben."⁴ He sees this transposition taking place only in Arabic, Assyrian and Moabite, while prefix-t forms occur in the other languages quite regularly.

The meaning of the t-forms, according to Brockelmann, is basically reflexive, the subject acting on itself as direct or indirect object.⁵ They can, however, have other meanings: reciprocal (Arabic,

¹ pp. 208-209

² Ibid., 207-215.

³ (Berlin: Verlag von Reuther und Reichard, 1908).

⁴ Ibid., 529. ⁵ Ibid., 533.

¹iḥṭasamū = "they quarrel with one another); passive (Arabic, ²itafaka = "to be destroyed").

De Lacy O'Leary¹ regards t also as the sign of the reflexive which appears in all the Semitic languages. It appears in the Arabic V form (reflexive of II) and in VI (reflexive of III), and "with metathesis it is attached to the primary, as قَتَلْ (conj. viii), reflexive of قَتَلَ (conj. i)."² Similarly, the Arabic X form, reflexive of IV, is a metathesized form of the s-causative: اِسْتَقْتَلْ < اِسْتَقْتَلْ. The t reflexive is employed freely in Abyssinian (Ethiopic), Hebrew, Aramaic, and Assyrian. In the first three languages only the preformative t (or ht) occurs, but in the last, metathesis takes place in every instance.³ O'Leary notes that t-constructions also have passive meaning, although it is usually not a true passive, e.g., عَلَّمَ = "teach"; تَعَلَّمَ = "become learned." The latter is "quasi-passive," rather than the true passive, "be taught."⁴ From this is derived an iterative meaning in Libyan, e.g., tsaf iterative of af, "to find."⁵ Reflexive and passive t-forms are also found in other African dialects, such as, Bishari, Kafa, Hausa and others. It is noted, too, that a t suffix occurs in ancient Egyptian, but its meaning is apparently not reflexive, although its real meaning has been lost.⁶

¹De Lacy O'Leary, Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1923).

²Ibid., 225.

³Ibid., 227.

⁴Ibid., 228.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

O'Leary points out that in Assyrian, t-forms occur with the N stem (passive) to form the Nt stem, e.g., attapras (< antapras) and with the Š causative to form the Št stem, e.g., uštapparras. The Akkadian infix-tan construction he takes as N passive plus t reflexive plus N passive again, e.g., attanapras (< antanapras).¹

Gotthelf Bergsträsser² also considers the reflexive with t-preformative as primary, i.e., Proto-Semitic, and that the infixed t-forms are the result of metathesis.³ This transposition "ist nur bei anlautendem Zischlaut schon ursemitisch und auf anderen Wurzelanlaut erst einzelsprachlich ausgedehnt worden."⁴

The meaning of the t forms is basically reflexive, according to Bergsträsser, although it has variations in other stems and individual languages: Akkadian, reflexive, reciprocal and passive;⁵ Aramaic, reflexive (fully replacing the N stem which is entirely lacking) and passive;⁶ Ethiopic, reflexive;⁷ Arabic, reflexive, passive, and reciprocal.⁸

In his Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics, Louis Gray remarks on the fact that both takatab- and katatab- forms occur in the various Semitic languages, the former in Hebrew, Aramaic, Tu-

¹Ibid., 229.

²Gotthelf Bergsträsser, Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen, (München: Verlag Max Hueber, 1928). Benno Landsberger acted as adviser on Akkadian matters, and the views there expressed are generally regarded as Landsberger's.

³Ibid., 13.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., 25.

⁶Ibid., 67.

⁷Ibid., 100.

⁸Ibid., 139-140.

nisian, Arabic and Ethiopic; the latter in Akkadian, Moabite, Arabic and Ugaritic.¹ He raises the question of whether two distinct formations should be theorized. On the basis that infix forms are not otherwise known in either Semitic verbs or nouns, he concludes "that it would seem more likely that katatab- has arisen from takatab- by metathesis."² Both types have reflexive and "quasi-passive" force.³

In the most recent major publication on comparative Semitics, Sabatino Moscati repeats the belief that infix-t forms are the result of metathesis.⁴ The meanings of t prefix and infix forms are reflexive, e.g., Ugaritic, yrthš = "he washes himself"; passive, e.g., Arabic, takassara = "he was shattered"; and reciprocal, e.g., Arabic, taqātalū = "they fought together."⁵

In the narrower range of comparative Semitics, i.e., that of the Northwest Semitic languages or the even narrower range of the Canaanite languages, two publications are noteworthy. The first is Zelig S. Harris' well-known work The Development of the Canaanite Dialects,⁶ and the second is the more recent Il Semitico di Nord-Ovest by Giovanni Garbini.⁷

Harris only casually mentions infix-t forms as they occur in

¹Louis H. Gray, Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934).

²Ibid., 82.

³Ibid.

⁴ICGSL, 127.

⁵Ibid., 127-129.

⁶Zelig S. Harris, The Development of the Canaanite Dialects (New Haven: The American Oriental Society, 1939).

⁷Giovanni Garbini, Il Semitico di Nord-Ovest (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1960).

Phoenician, Moabite and in a few Hebrew place names. He notes their occurrence also in Ugaritic and in the Amarna letters but takes no position regarding their formation by metathesis in prefix-t forms. He notes that it passes out of use in all the attested languages, probably before the tenth century B.C.¹

Garbini also treats the infix-t forms rather lightly. "Il tema riflessivo con t infissa" fell into disuse throughout all the Northwest Semitic languages so that, with the exception of Moabite, such forms are not found after the ninth century B.C.²

Before going on to a consideration of the use of infix-t forms in the individual languages, it would seem that a few remarks are necessary at this point regarding the point of view expressed by the scholars in the publications reviewed above. The almost unanimously held opinion is that the primitive form of the reflexive theme was expressed by a prefix-t affixed to the verbal root. This new stem later developed a semi-passive, then a fully passive meaning, and finally also could express reciprocity. Phonetically, the t preformative remained as the first element of the verbal stem except when it was followed by a sibilant as the first root letter and then it changed places (metathesis) with that letter. Gradually, the process of metathesis became more and more frequent until, in some languages, it became the only t-form. Thus, original qbr became reflexive by the addition of t: tqbr, but when the first root letter was a sibilant, as in šmr, the reflexive form tšmr became štšmr. Gradually, however, by analogy,

¹Harris, Development, p. 62.

²Garbini, Il Semitico, p. 130.

even tqbr became qtbr. The same process took place in the other verbal stems: in the intensive (qbbr), original tqbbr became qtbbbr; in the causative stem (šqbr), original tšqbr became štqbr; and, where it occurred, the N stem (nqbr) also followed this process, tnqbr became ntqbr. In this last example, the n was generally assimilated to the t to create ttqbr.

It must be remembered that, according to the writers of the comparative grammars described above, this metathesis took place in some of the languages, such as Moabite, Phoenician and Akkadian (always in the latter), and did not occur in Hebrew, Aramaic and Ethiopic. Arabic apparently presents a special case, for it retained some prefix-t forms (V and VI conjugations) and some infix-t forms (VIII conjugation).

There are many weaknesses in the above scheme. The fact that two separate kinds of t constructions exist in Arabic strongly suggests that they had separate ancestors in Proto-Semitic. This is supported by evidence from Phoenician where, also, both infix and prefix-t constructions are found.¹ Further, there is no reason to suppose that metathesis should occur in some verb forms and not in others when the same consonants are involved. Using examples from Wright's Arabic Grammar,² it is seen that in Arabic, both prefix and infix-t forms occur with identical initial root letters, with the first two letters of word roots identical and even in some identical triradical roots:

¹PPG, 64.

²GAL, 36-42.

Table 2

Comparison of Arabic VIII Conjugation Roots Appearing Also in
Arabic V and/or VI Conjugations

A. Identical first root letters

VIII	V	VI
'ms; 'qw	'sd; 'tm; 'bt; 'tb	
jif	jwf	jzr, jr'; jzb
hwr	hr'	hhl
rd'		rmv
sbq	sm'	sm'; sqt
'rd	'zm; 'lm	'my; 'ly; 'zm; 'yn
frs	fwq; f'l	
qrq; qss; qf'	qld	
ksb; k'l	klm	klm
ml'	mhs; mr'	mwt; mrq; msk
nqr	nmr; nqr; nb'	nz'; nst; nwr; nws
yfk	yb'; yqn	

B. First two root letters identical

VIII	V	VI
'rd	'rq; 'rb; 'rf	
frs	frq	
ksb	ksr	

C. Identical triradical roots

VIII	V	VI
qrb	qrb	
qtl		qtl
nqr	nqr	

If metathesis were responsible for infix forms, it should conform to some sort of regularity, i.e., transposition would have to occur regularly with certain letters and not with others. This is not the case. Infix-t forms are thus not merely prefix forms which have

undergone transposition of the t-element and the first radical. They are genuine and independent, used consciously by the user, as we shall see, for specific purposes.

The study of infix-t forms begins with Akkadian in which they attain both their greatest complexity and antiquity. In spite of years of research, the study is fraught with difficulties and unanswered questions. Even the recognition of the forms themselves is difficult, for they often coincide exactly with other forms, the process of assimilation disguises many others, and the peculiarities and inconsistencies of cuneiform writing complicate already very complicated matters.

Akkadian has four major stems or conjugations, the G or Ground stem, the D or Doubled (second root letter) stem, the Š, or Causative stem and the N, or passive stem. Each of these stems can add infixed-t elements which cause changes in the meaning of the verb in question. There infixed-t elements occur in three forms, -ta-, -tata- and -tan-.

Von Soden¹ symbolizes the stems, thus:

G:	Gt	Gtn	Gtt
D:	Dt	Dtn	Dtt
Š:	Št	Štn	Štt
N:		Ntn	

Many scholars, however, continue to use the Delitzsch system²

¹GAG, 111-112. Von Soden has adopted the system of A. Ungnad, for which see Grammatik des Akkadischen, 4th ed., revised by Lubor Matouš (München: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1964), pp. 71-72. Ungnad, however, represented the Gtt, etc., differently, using the symbol R for the reduplicated second radical and thus designating the -tata- forms as Rt.

²Friedrich Delitzsch, Assyrische Grammatik (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1906), pp. 235-236.

whereby the Roman numerals I-IV designate the G, D, Š and N stems respectively, and the number 1 stands for the form without infix, 2 stands for the -ta- infixed forms, and 3 for the -tan- infixed forms. Thus, II 2 indicates the stem with doubled second radical and infixed -ta-; III 3 indicates the causative stem (Š) with infixed -tan-, etc.¹ The von Soden system is followed in this paper.

As in most of the Semitic languages, the letter n is often assimilated to a following consonant in Akkadian. The n of the -tan- stem is no exception and is frequently lost. Orthographically, the form becomes identical with the infixed-t: iptan-ras > iptarras. But note that the doubled r is only inconsistently represented and the form may as well appear, iptaras. Similarly, the n of the N stem frequently is assimilated to the first radical: intapras > ittapras.² In Middle/Late Babylonian and Middle Assyrian, št becomes lt: uštapis > ultapis.³ As in Arabic, dt > dd; tt > tt; tz > zz; ts > ss; st > ss, and, of course, again, the doubled radicals are not always indicated in cuneiform.

Difficult as identification may be, however, translation of the infix-t forms is infinitely more difficult. Semitic scholars disagree widely on the meaning of these verbal constructions. Shortly after 1939, A. Leo Oppenheim circulated a duplicated copy of a Digest of Discussions Concerning the Meaning and Function of the Akkadian Verbal Forms with t-Infix,⁴ in which are summarized the views of several scholars, B. Lands-

¹To these forms have been added the I 4, IV 4, I 5, etc., representing the Gtt₁, Ntt₁, Gtt₂, etc. See Wolfram von Soden, "Verbalformen mit doppletem t-Infix im Akkadischen," Orientalia 25 (1956), 385.

²GAG, 112.

³Ibid., 116.

⁴I am indebted to Prof. Oppenheim for a copy of the Digest which

berger, G. Bergsträsser, A. Goetze, A. Ungnad, Oppenheim, himself, and others. Since that time, other scholars have written on the subject, but even at this writing the problem is far from settled. A brief review of the most important of these studies is in order here.

Delitzsch, in 1906, regarded the infix-t forms as either reflexive or passive in meaning,¹ but Landsberger noted that there were many cases where the meanings could not be passive or reflexive. His view is reflected in Bergsträsser's Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen² for which he was the advisor on the Akkadian language. The infix-t forms may be used to indicate different strata in time. The Akkadian present (iprus) expresses an earlier time and the t-stem (iptaras) expresses a later time. In conditional sentences, the protasis may use either the present or the t-stem (or the present followed by the t-stem if the action takes place in two stages), and the apodosis will use the "present with secondary doubling (iparras)."³ Characteristic of Akkadian only is the subjective use of the t-form where iprus indicates the past, iptaras indicates the (punctual) present and iparras indicates the future or the durative present.⁴

In his article, "The Verb in the Kirkuk Tablets,"⁵ S. N. Kramer

was forwarded in response to my request. The work is mentioned in G. R. Castellino, The Akkadian Personal Pronouns and Verbal System in Light of Semitic and Hamitic (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), p. 136, note 2, where I first learned of it.

¹Delitzsch, Grammatik, pp. 236-239.

²See also his views in Islamica, II (1926), p. 361 and note 2.

³Ibid., 23. ⁴Ibid.

⁵Samuel N. Kramer, "The Verb in the Kirkuk Tablets," AASOR, XI (1931), 63-119.

notes that in these Middle Babylonian tablets "there is not a single instance when the middle stem with the t-element shows either reflexive or passive meaning."¹ He adopts the position that there is no essential difference between the t-stem and the active stem (or simple stem). He notes that the t-stems are used almost exclusively with the preterite, seldom with the present.² The conclusion he draws is that the t-stem began to lose its reflexive force very early in its history, and it then could displace the simple stem at will. Since the "preterite iksud lacks bulk, when compared with the present ikašad the use of the t-stem to express it became frequent."³

A thorough and illuminating study of this problem in Old Babylonian was undertaken by A. Leo Oppenheim,⁴ and the results were published in 1933. According to this author, the Hamitic dialects of North Africa provide the missing link between the Akkadian use of the t-stems and the use of the same forms in other Semitic languages. The t-forms in Hamitic indicate durative, habitative, intensive and reflexive action.⁵ From this, most of the Semitic languages used the t-forms reflexively and passively, while Akkadian developed in a special way.

¹Ibid., 77.

²Ibid., 77-78.

³Ibid., 78.

⁴A Leo Oppenheim, "Die mittels T-Infixes gebildeten Aktionsarten des Altbabylonischen," WZKM 42 (1935), 1-30. See also his article, "Die Rolle der T-Formen im Codex Hammurapi," WZKM 40 (1933), 181-220. On the basis of the inconsistent usage of t-forms in CH, Oppenheim proposes a two source theory. This theory is opposed by von Soden; see "Verbalformen mit doppeltem t-Infix im Akkadischen," Orientalia 25 (1956), 386, note 2.

⁵Oppenheim, "Die mittles T-Infixes," 4.

For Oppenheim, the use of t-forms in Akkadian is subjective, indicating feeling or sentiment on the part of the speaker who then uses the infix-t construction to indicate the intensity of his feelings.¹ Oppenheim also notes that the infix-t can have a perfectivating force as well as an intensifying force,² e.g., adi abnu i-raš-su-su bâb kûri lu tukattam ultu abnu ir-taš-su bâb kûri tukattam.³

"Until the stone is red-hot, do not shut the door of the oven; After the stone has become red-hot, shut the door of the oven."

In the foregoing, the infix-t form ir-taš-su completes the action of the sentence. In his analysis of this use of the t-stem, Oppenheim is not far from the "time-strata" theory of Landsberger/Bergsträsser.

Oppenheim notes the infrequency of the occurrence of distinct reflexive-passive t-forms in Akkadian which he says, without further explanation, is due to foreign (Sumerian) influence.⁴ Nevertheless, he cites a few examples of reflexive-passive infix-t forms.⁵ He also discusses the so-called infix-tan-forms which he sees as the combination of the intensifying t plus the durative n which produce the designation of habitual action,⁶ (Intensiv + Duratio = Habitude⁷).

Lewy, who wrote at about the same time as Oppenheim, expresses

¹Ibid., 12-18.

²Ibid., 18.

³Ibid., 20. Oppenheim's translation is: "Bis dass der Stein rotglühend ist, schliesst du das Tor des (Schmelz) ofens nicht; nachdem der Stein rotglühend geworden ist, schliesst du das Tor des (Schmelz) ofens."

⁴Ibid., 24.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., 25-26.

⁷Ibid., 26.

his belief that t-forms in the Kultepe texts, Old Babylonian letters and Middle Assyrian law code indicate actual occurrence of possible or expected action. The verbs should be translated by adding "nunmehr" or "jetzt wirklich," i.e., actually, indeed.¹

The most widely accepted interpretation of the infix-t constructions in Akkadian is that of Albrecht Goetze.² After rejecting the theories of Delitzsch, Landsberger, Ungnad and Oppenheim, and working with the Old Babylonian dialect, he proceeds to relate his own theory under three main headings: "A. the t-form in the function of tense coordinated clauses; B. the t-form in the function of a relative tense in subordinated clauses; C. the t-form as an aspect."³ Under "A" he makes a thorough study of the infix-t forms in the Code of Hammurabi and concludes, "the assumption is justified that it is the function of the t-form—or at least one of its functions—to link the past to the present; that it denotes the action which has just been performed and still affects the situation. The best rendering, then, is (wherever possible) by the English perfect 'someone has done something,' 'something has happened,' 'something has been done.'"⁴ Exceptions to this are found generally after negations,⁵ with some verbs, such as bašum = "to exist"; išum = "to have"; le'um = "to be able"; idūm = "to know"; erēšum = "to demand"; hiātum = "to search," and possibly, ezēbum =

¹Georg Eissner and Julius Lewy, "Die Altassyrischen Rechtsurkunden vom Kultepe, Kollationsergebnis, Beachtungen und Nachträge," MVAeG, 35 Band, 3 Heft (1935), 169, note 1.

²Albrecht Goetze, "The t-Form of the Old Babylonian Verb," JPOS, 56 (1936), 297-334.

³Ibid., 302.

⁴Ibid., 312.

⁵Ibid., 313-316.

"to take leave,"¹ and, usually when dative suffixes are attached to the verb.² In the imperative, prohibitive and precative (request), t-forms occur frequently, although they are not obligatory.³

In "B," Goetze notes that t-forms in dependent clauses are used chiefly as they are employed in main clauses, under "A" above. However, as Landsberger has noted, a t-form is also a way of designating "the consecutio temporum and denotes the future perfect."⁴ It refers to the stratum of the action as seen by the speaker and indicates continuing interest. Thus, if the first (non-t-stem) verb is in the past (preterite), the t-verb will be in the past perfect; if it is in the future (present), the t-verb will be in the future perfect.⁵

In section "C," Goetze remarks that there are many instances where the t-infix is used with different meanings. Among these he lists distinct reflexive-reciprocal force⁶ and, with verbs of motion, separative force, denoting movement away from a given point.⁷ It is his belief that the reflexive-reciprocal force is a vestige of Proto-Semitic usage, and that the separative force is due to Sumerian influence.⁸

Goetze then, to summarize his position, holds that the infix-t forms in Akkadian are employed in several different ways. He divides

¹Ibid., 316-317. These verbs "denote conditions which remain unchanged, have no recognizable beginning or end. Therefore, they are incapable of expressing an action which has occurred and which influences the present." (p. 317).

²Ibid., 317-319.

³Ibid., 319.

⁴Ibid., 320.

⁵Ibid., 321.

⁶Ibid., 323.

⁷Ibid., 324.

⁸Ibid., 333-334.

the forms into those that indicate reflexive-reciprocal action, those that designate separative force, and those (and this includes the largest number of the forms) that imply an "extension in time" and indicate previous action which has a continuing effect in the present.

The famous German scholar, Arthur Ungnad rejects the views of Oppenheim and Goetze in an article entitled, "Die t-Form des akkadischen Verbs."¹ Ungnad, basing his conclusions on Neo-Babylonian materials, sees the use of t-forms as indicating the inner impulse of the person to do something: iddin = "he gave," due to outside causes or influences; ittadin = "he gave," because his own impulse caused him to give.² Thus one can add the words "intentionally, on purpose," etc., to the translation of the verb.³

Ugnad's theory is repudiated by San Nicolo,⁴ who shows that the t-forms in the Code of Hammurabi do not agree with Ungnad's contention.⁵ While acknowledging the fact that he is contributing nothing new to Assyriological studies, San Nicolo indicates that it will take considerable further study in the grammatical-syntactical area before the problem is solved.⁶

A. Poebel contributes to the discussion in various places in

¹ Arthur Ungnad, "Die t-Form des akkadischen Verbs," Orientalia 6 (1937), 252-255.

² Ibid., 252-253. ³ Ibid.

⁴ M. San Nicolo, "Juristische Bemerkungen zur Bedeutung der t-Formen des akkadischen Zeitwortes," Orientalia 7 (1938), 309-318.

⁵ Ibid., 311-313.

⁶ Ibid., 318.

his "Unrecognized forms of I/3 Formation" which appeared in 1939.¹ He ascribes several different functions to the various infix-t forms. With verbs of motion, infix-t lends a separative connotation (away from the center of action),² and with many verbs it gives a reciprocal meaning.³ It can also be used to express "temporal precedence,"⁴ or, as in the inscription of Assur-nasir-apli, to express the pluperfect, "after he had done this . . . ,"⁵ thus indicating the subordination of infix-t stems to those stems without the t-element: Infix-tan forms express repeated action; infix-t forms never do.⁶

Out of the chaos, a semblance of order has been brought by Wolfram von Soden in his authoritative, Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik.⁷ He proposes two kinds of infix-t constructions, one which modifies tense, the other which modifies the stem of the verb. The forms which indicate tense, he calls the "perfect," for they are used in the perfective sense.⁸ The perfect is cast alongside the preterite and present tenses of Akkadian. The perfect is used in the following ways:⁹

¹Arno Poebel, "Unrecognized Forms of I/3 Formation," Studies in Akkadian Grammar No. 1, AS 9 (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1939).

²Ibid., 28, note 1. ³Ibid., 13. ⁴Ibid., 30.

⁵Ibid., 31, note 1. ⁶Ibid., 18.

⁷Commonly abbreviated here and elsewhere: GAG. See the Bibliography for publication data.

⁸GAG, 104.

⁹That which follows is based upon GAG, 104-105, and the examples are von Soden's from these same pages.

1. In Old Babylonian and Old Assyrian, it indicates action which has just now happened and has still an effect on the situation. It is used commonly after the Akkadian words inanna (now) and anumma (now, at this time). In Old Babylonian, the t-perfect is seldom used in negative sentences or in questions, but it occurs occasionally in negative sentences in Old Assyrian.

e.g. Old Babylonian: imtīdā: "are now become many"

Old Assyrian: iṣṣabtanni: "has now seized me"

ula uštebilakkum: "I have not sent you now."

2. In letters, the tense is sometimes used to express coincidental action, e.g., aštaprakkum: "I am writing you herewith."

3. In Old Babylonian and Old Assyrian, the t-perfect expresses consecutive stage(s) of action arising out of an earlier action, e.g., ašam-ma ibtaqrūninni: "I bought (something) and (afterwards) they claimed it from me."

4. In temporal and relative clauses, it sometimes expresses the futurum exactum (completed action in future time), e.g., ad mati itaklanni: "until he shall have consumed me."

5. In Old Babylonian, Old Assyrian, Middle/Late Babylonian and Middle/New Assyrian, the t-infix can be used somewhat subjectively to express strength of feeling. Thus it is found frequently in letters, some historical accounts, but almost never in royal inscriptions and legal documents. None of these, however, use the Perfect in negative sentences, questions, and relative clauses, "weil solche Sätze in der Regel keinen affirmativen, sondern nur konstatierenden Charakter haben."¹

¹Ibid., 105.

From the t-form of the perfect tense, von Soden distinguishes the t-form of the derived verbal stems, i.e., Gt, Dt, Št, and the related Gtn, Dtn, Štn and Ntn; Nt is not attested. To these stems he ascribes the following meanings:

1. General. Gt, Dt, Št: The infix-t indicates primarily a change in direction of the action away from the subject (separative force), and passive, reciprocal and, sporadically, reflexive meaning.¹

2. Examples of Gt:

a) Reciprocal force: šalum = "to ask"; šitulum = "to counsel together."

b) With verbs of motion, separative force: alākum = "to go"; atlukum = "to go-from there."

c) Durative force:² šitkunum = "to set down for the duration"; aštammar = "I worship for all time."

d) Reflexive force: The only example of reflexive force is found in Middle Babylonian piššaš = "anoint yourself!"

3. Examples of Dt:

a) Passive force: uštallamū: "they will be held safely."

b) Reflexive force (occasionally): šutabbi = "sate yourself."

c) Reciprocal force (occasionally): uktaššaru = "they will be mixed together (with each other)."

The Št stem appears in two forms. The less frequent uštapras

¹Ibid., 120.

²Von Soden indicates that from the durative meaning, habitative meaning may arise, but the only example he gives with this meaning is "litbušum = sich ganz und gar bekleiden," QAG, 121.

is designated Št₁; the more common uštapparras is designated Št₂.

4. Example of Št₁: Passive force: uštalpīt = "was destroyed."

5. Examples of Št₂:

a) Reciprocal force: šutašbutum = "to cause (pieces of equipment) to mesh together."

b) Intransitive, inner passive (derived from some adjectives):
šutamriš = "try hard!": (from maṣum = "difficult")

c) Durative force: šušurum = "to keep in order" (from ešērum = "to be in order").¹

With the Gtn, Dtn, Štn and Ntn stems, difficulty arises in distinguishing the -tan- from the -t-infix, since the n is assimilated to a following consonant.² Thus the form is clearly recognizable only in the Akkadian Present: iptanarras, but iptanras > iptarras. Only the context can indicate whether the -t- or -tan- infix is intended, and often the answer must be left in an indecisive state.

The meanings of -tan- forms are usually either iterative or habitative:

1. Iterative force: aštanappar = "I write again and again," (Gtn).

uštanašbat = "He will cause to seize again and again," (Štn).

2. Habitative force: aktanarrabakkum = "I am accustomed to (i.e., in the habit of) praying for you," (Gt).

¹This is attested only in the verb ešērum.

²GAG, 112. The examples in that which follows are from von Soden.

3. Distributive force: limtahharū: "They may at times conceive," (Dtn).
 4. "To and fro": attanallak = "I go to and fro," (Ntn).

The so-called double t-infix, Gtt, Dtt, Štt and Ntt, also occurs in Akkadian. For some time it was considered only a variant form of the regular t-infix¹ but von Soden has shown that it is in reality the combination of the perfect tense and infix-t (or infix-tan).² Thus, the first infixed -ta- is the sign of the perfect; the second is the sign of the derived stem, and, as usual, the -tan-stem is often indistinguishable from the t-stem because of the assimilation of n to the following consonant. The meanings of the stem remain unchanged, but the addition of the first infixed-t element changes the tense of the verb as outlined above, page 62. It should be noted, however, that the -tt- and -ttn-forms appear to be a later development in the Akkadian dialects, for they occur only in the "younger," i.e., Middle Babylonian, Middle/Late Assyrian, texts.³

In his Grundriss, von Soden expresses doubt as to the origin of the infix-t forms in Akkadian; neither is he sure of the connection between the t-infix of the Perfect which modifies the tense and the t-infix of the derived stems.⁴ In a more recent article, however, he suggests that the t-perfect may be the result of the influence of Sumerian

¹Poebel, "Unrecognized Forms," 29-30.

²GAG, 122. See especially von Soden, "Verbalformen," Orientalia 25 (1956), 385-396.

³Ibid., 388-389.

⁴Ibid., 104.

verbal forms upon Akkadian.¹ He states cautiously,

Wir konnten feststellen, dass akkadische Perfectformen in verschiedenen Gebrauchweisen sumerische Formen mit den Präfixen ba- und (seltener) imma- wiedergaben bzw. ähnlich wie diese verwendet wurden.²

In this respect, he echoes the thoughts of Oppenheim and Goetze expressed some years earlier.³ The formation of the -tan- constructions, which Oppenheim regarded as the combination of t + the durative element n, is not readily accepted by von Soden, since -ta- itself appears to have habitative meaning in some instances.⁴

For the moment, here the matter rests. The conclusions of von Soden are accepted by many competent scholars who base current work on these conclusions.⁵ Not all questions are yet answered, however,

¹Wolfram von Soden, "Das akkadische T-Perfect in Haupt- und Nebensätzen und sumerische Verbalformen mit den Präfixen BA-, IMMA-, und U-," Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-fifth Birthday April 21, 1965, Assyriological Studies No. 16 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 103-110.

²Ibid., 108-109.

³Oppenheim, "Die mittels T-Infixes," 24; Goetze, "The t-Form," 333.

⁴GAG, 119-120.

⁵Among these scholars may be listed I. J. Gelb, BiOr XII (1955), 110, who incidentally disagrees with von Soden on the occurrence of Nt stems, D. O. Edzard, "Die Stämme des altbabylonischen Verbals in ihrem Oppositionssystem," Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-fifth Birthday April 21, 1965, Assyriological Studies No. 16 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965) pp. 111-120. Similarly the revision of Ungnad's Babylonisch-assyrische Grammatik by Lubor Matouš: Grammatik des Akkadischen (München: C. H. Beck, 1964), pp. 77-81, abandons the original interpretation of the t-infix stems and follows, generally, the von Soden line. See also the recent work of Erica Reiner, A Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966).

and further discoveries, translations and analyses are needed before definitive answers can be given. The work of von Soden is presently under revision by the author, himself, and it may be that publication will throw further light on the problem of infix-t forms in the Akkadian dialects.¹

The Arabic language uses prefix and infix-t constructions extensively in its verbal system.² Prefix-t is attested in the Arabic V (tafa'ala) and VI (tafa'ala); infix-t occurs in the VIII ('ifta'ala) and X ('istafa'ala). All four forms give reflexive meaning to their corresponding simple forms, thus:

V: Reflexive of II.³ ta'arraba = "to call oneself an Arab."

VI: Reflexive of III.⁴ taramaya = "to throw oneself down."

VIII: Reflexive or middle of I.⁵ 'i'tarafa = "to put oneself in the way, to oppose."

X: Reflexive or middle of IV.⁶ 'istaslama = "to give oneself up" (i.e., "to cause oneself to be given up").

¹New light on the problem of the Akkadian verbal system has already been cast, in my opinion, by G. R. Castellino, The Akkadian Personal Pronouns, but the discussion of this material seems better placed later in this chapter.

²See page 40 above.

³GAL, I, 36. See also G. W. Thatcher, Arabic Grammar (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.), pp. 94-96.

⁴Ibid., 38.

⁵Ibid., 42.

⁶Ibid., 44.

The above holds true for Epigraphic South Arabian¹ as well as for Classical North Arabic.

Meanings other than reflexive are also found, but generally they are still closely connected to the primary meaning:

1. Passive: V: takassara = "to be broken into pieces."

VIII: ^ʔiytafaka = "to be overturned."

2. Reciprocal: VI: tagatalā = "the two fought with one another."

VIII: ^ʔigtatala = "they fought with one another."

Some of the Arabic verbal stems with t constructions show special usages and meanings:

V: Effective force:² ta^ʕallama = "to become learned," from ʕalima = "to know"; tabayyana = "to appear certain," from bāna = "to be clear."

VI: Successive action:³ tasāqata = "to fall piece by piece."

VIII: Actions for the sake of oneself: ^ʔiẖtataba = "to collect firewood (for oneself)."

¹Maria Höfner, Altsüdarabische Grammatik (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1943), pp. 83-87, and A. F. L. Beeston, A Descriptive Grammar of Epigraphic South Arabian (London: Lyzack & Co. Ltd., 1962), pp. 19-21. Note, however, that Beeston, p. 21, does not agree with Höfner's statement (Altsüdarabische Grammatik, p. 83) that Epigraphic South Arabian verb stems are closely allied to those of North Arabic. He bases his argument on the fact that the rare occurrence of the VII ("n-prefix") form, and the existence of a tagatla stem shows closer relationship to Ethiopic than North Arabic. His point is that Höfner's conclusions are drawn on insufficient evidence, due in particular to lack of evidence concerning the vocalization of the stems.

²GAL, I, 38.

³Ibid., 40.

X: Estimative force:¹ ʾistaḥalla = "he thought that it was lawful."

Asking or seeking:² ʾistaʿfara = "to ask pardon";
ʾistafāta = "to call for help."

Denominative force:³ ʾistaklafa = "to appoint oneself as calif (i.e., to cause oneself to be calif)."

The quadrilateral verbs also show occasional use of prefix-t in the II form, tafaʿlala, e.g., tasaltana = "to make oneself sultan." These occurrences are generally reflexive and correspond to the V form of the triradical verb.⁴

There appears to be little difference in meaning among the various prefixed and infixed-t constructions in Arabic. They all lend a reflexive or other related sense to the basic meaning of the stem to which it is affixed. It should be noted, however, that t-forms are not the only means for indicating the reflexive, reciprocal, or passive action of the verb. Thus, Arabic III may imply reciprocity⁵ as ṣāraḥu = "he wrestled with him," ṣāwarahu = "he consulted with him," and VII may imply reflexive and passive action,⁶ ʾinṣaqqa = "to open itself (a flower)," ʾinkasara = "to be broken." According to Wright,⁷ the VII form originally was the reflexive (mutāwiʿun) of I, the simple

¹Ibid., 44-45.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 45-46.

⁴Ibid., 47-48.

⁵Ibid., 32-33.

⁶Ibid., 40-41.

⁷Ibid., 40. See also Thatcher, Arabic Grammar, p. 112.

stem. The difference between VII and VIII is that the former never takes an indirect object and never has reciprocal force.¹ Passive voice is also, of course, expressed in Arabic by internal vowel changes, thus: ḡaraba = "he struck," ḡuriba = "he was struck."²

The language of Ras Shamra-Ugarit, within the boundaries of rather limited available material, exhibits rather free use of infix-t forms. So far, they are attested only in the prefix conjugation and in the Gt and St stems, but usage in other stems may be expected in later inscriptions.³ According to C. H. Gordon, the infix-t forms are reflexive and do not usually take a direct object.⁴ While the latter half of this statement appears correct, the first half, regarding the reflexive force of the infix-t verbs, does not hold up under close scrutiny. Since Ugaritic and Hebrew stand in rather close relationship, it seems worthwhile here to examine closely the occurrence of the Gt and St stems in the documents of Ras Shamra.

It is impossible to find any consistent usage which fits all the infix-t forms found in Ugaritic. They are employed with both transitive and intransitive verbs, and while they appear chiefly in the poetic mythology of the Canaanite city, they also appear in semi-poetic and prose texts.⁵ One cannot help but recall the words of Professor Leo

¹GAL, I, 40.

²Ibid., 49; Thatcher, Arabic Grammar, pp. 89-90.

³UT, 81, "It would be no surprise to find, for instance, Dt, tR and tL." (The last two stems, of course, are prefix-t.)

⁴Ibid.

⁵This distinction is made by C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Literature

Oppenheim regarding the subjective use of infix-t forms in Akkadian.¹ It does, indeed, seem that, in many cases, the use or non-use of Gt constructions depend upon the whim of the scribe, or perhaps of the original author of the text.

As noted above, page 44, Gt and $\check{S}t$ stems are usually regarded as reflexive in meaning. In reflexive phrases, the subject acts so that he, the subject, is the beneficiary of that action.² Usually, then, reflexive constructions can only occur with transitive verbs, where the direct object and the subject are one and the same. If we adhere to this definition, and do not broaden it to include constructions where the subject and direct object are different, we find few reflexive examples of Gt and even the rather scarce occurrences of $\check{S}t$ are open to question.

Examples of reflexive Gt are found in the following:

'nt:III:44:³ (43) . . . $\check{im}th\check{s} w$ (44) $\check{it}rt.hrg$: "I fought and took possession of the gold." The root is $yrt < wrt$ which means "to inherit" or "take possession of," and it occurs in several Semitic languages. In Ugaritic it occurs elsewhere only in G, and then only twice, 137:19, 35.

(Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1949). The semi-Poetic texts are further divided into religious texts, epistles, a diplomatic text, administrative texts, hippiatric prescriptions and inventories.

¹Oppenheim, "Die mittels T- Infixes," WZKM 42.

²Mario A. Pei and Frank Gaynor, A Dictionary of Linguistics (New York: Philosophical Library, 1954), p. 184.

³The classification of Ugaritic texts used in this paper is C. H. Gordon's, UT, pp. 257-296.

These two passages are identical and are to be translated, "I shall inherit (or take possession of) the gold."¹ It is to be noted here that the verb "inherit" has a kind of built-in reflexiveness, for one usually inherits for oneself, and the Gt formation, if reflexive in nature is unnecessary. Thus, the form 'itrt may arise by analogy with the Gt form, 'mths, to which it lies parallel, it may give a different meaning to the ground stem (e.g., passive force), or it may serve simply to emphasize the reflexive nature of the phrase. While the first explanation is possible, it does not seem likely, since there are many examples where parallel verbs occur in the sequence Gt:G, e.g., 'itlk.wagd (49:II:15); yrths.wyadm (Krt:156).² As far as can be ascertained from the context, the t-infix imparts no new meaning to the verb, so it would seem that

¹Aistleitner, WUS, 262, translates pd as "ax" (German Axt), but he acknowledges its possible derivation from the Proto-Semitic root pd (Hebrew pz), "gold."

²Some examples of Gt//G involve a G verb whose second root letter is a dental or sibilant. In Arabic, Akkadian and other Semitic languages, a "t" is frequently assimilated to an adjacent dental or sibilant. Thus, it is conceivable that wyadm could actually represent wyâtdm > wyâddm. Since doubled letters are usually not represented orthographically in Ugaritic, the word would naturally appear as given in the texts cited. If this analysis should be correct, we would then have Gt//Gt in some other cases where a Gt verb is in a parallel construction with another verb. This would be supported by the fact that many examples of Gt//Gt do exist in Ugaritic texts, e.g., 2:16, 17, 25, 33, 34, (ytâi//ytâi); 52:31, (mât'ltm.mât'ltm, if the root be s'1 rather than the št of 'yl); 127:29, 42 ('istm//wtqg); 131:6; 'nt:6, 20, 24, 30, (tmths//thtqb), and elsewhere.

The weight of evidence, however, must legislate against the possible analysis just given, for there are clear examples where the G verb of a Gt//G construction cannot be construed as an infix-t form, e.g., 49:VI:24 (tmths//yâm'k); 49:II:15 ('itlk.wagd—the root is gwd); 68:13, 15, 20, 23 (trtqs//hlm). Note here, however, the fact that an imperfect Gt parallels a perfect G. This is a rare occurrence in Ugaritic. It is also apparent, although orthographic peculiarities make it difficult to be certain of one's ground, that assimilation of t to an adjacent dental or sibilant does not usually take place in Ugaritic. In the last

the Gt can be used only for emphasis, i.e., "I, myself, will take possession," or "I will, indeed, take possession."

The verb 'sp which is found in Krt:18 also may be taken as reflexive in nature:

(18) mhmt.y'tsp (19) ršp . . . = "a fifth (child) Ršp gathered unto himself."

The verb can also mean "to remove" or "take" and Aistleitner translates the passage with this meaning in mind: "Die fünfte hat die Seuche (Ršp) hingerafft."¹ Taking the agent as impersonal "disease," rather than a god,² the verb is translated in the sense of "taken away," with separative force, instead of reflexive force. As with the verb yrt, the verb in question here, 'sp, if used in the sense of "to gather," needs no reflexive element added to it, for the subject is usually the beneficiary of the gathering. If the Gt construction is reflexive, it can only serve as emphasis of that fact. This is borne out by the evidence of the G stem usage of 'asp:

75:II:25: y'isp.hm. (b/d) = "he (Baal?) gathers them (with)."

1Aq:66, 73: t'ispk.yd.'aqht = "may the hand of 'Aqht gather thee."

While the first example from document 75 is fragmentary, it seems that the sense of both passages is to "gather to oneself," reflexive without the element "t."

examples of Gt//Gt just given, thtšb shows that t and š can stand together without assimilation.

¹MKT, 89. So also G. R. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), p. 29.

²UL, 67, and repeated in the more recent UT, 468.

Similarly, rhš = "to wash" is used in both Gt and G stems with the apparent idea "to wash oneself":

G: <nt:II:38: [t]hšpn.mh.wtrhš (39) [t]l.šmm¹ = "She gathers her water and washes (herself) (with) dew of heaven."

Gt: Krt:156: yrthš.wyadm² = "He washes and rouges himself."²

Again, it appears that the infix-t is used for emphasis. The Gt of rhš is used on special occasions, in preparation for offering sacrifice (Krt:62, 156), and in preparation for exacting vengeance (1Aq:203). This is shown also be the parallel verb, "to rouge or redden oneself." Such occasions demand greater involvement of the person, and thus we find the infix-t in the common verb of washing. It is not needed with 'adm, for it indicates enough meaning in itself.

It is interesting to consider the possibility of habitative force in connection with the usage of the verb rhš, i.e., as though it were an Akkadian -tan- form (yrtnhš > yrthhš). In the two G occurrences where direct objects do not appear, the goddess washes herself in the

¹The same phrase occurs in <nt:IV:86 without the broken beginnings of the lines. In all other occurrences of rhš in G, the verb has a direct object: his hands (Krt:157); his clothes: (2Aq:I:34; II:7; 23); me (1Aq:20), etc.

²The same phrase occurs in the feminine (trthš.wtadm) in 1Aq: 203; Krt:62. The other two cases of rhš in Gt are too fragmentary to shed light on this question (6:18; 37:3).

³The color red was sacred in ancient Palestine. See Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1961) p. 296, regarding the sacred red leather portable tent of the Arabic bedouin. Compare the red of the Tent of Meeting and the garments of the priests (Ex. 36-39). A "red heifer without blemish" is demanded for offering to Yhwh (Num. 19:2). The army of God is dressed in red with shields of the same color (Nah. 2:2). Especially honored are men of ruddy complexion: David (1 Sam. 16:12; 17:42), "my beloved," (Song of Sol. 5:10) and the princes of Israel (Lam. 4:7).

"dew of heaven," certainly an unusual non-habitative act. Where the Gt forms are found, though, the washing is habitual, as upon arising and preparing for sacrifice. The verb ʾadm is non-t-form because the action involved is reserved for very special events and is not habitual. Unless one considers warfare and fighting habitual, however, other examples of habitative "tan" forms are difficult to find or stretch the evidence too far to give certain evidence.

The verb ʿql = "to proceed" may also be included among the possible reflexive uses of infix-t forms. It appears four times in Gt: 1Aq:170; 2Aq:II:24: dníl.bth.ym.ʿyn.yšt (171) ql.dníl.lhklh¹ = "Dníl goes to his house; Dníl proceeds to his palace."

ʿnt:II:17: (17) . . . ʿnt.lbth.tmgyn (18) tštql.ʿlt.lhklh = "ʿnt goes to her house; the goddess proceeds to her palace."

In 62:41, we find ltštql which may be translated, "You shall not proceed," or, taking the preformative l as asseverative instead of negative, "You will indeed proceed." The rest of the text is broken and its situation in context cannot be determined.

Gordon² ascribes a meaning of "to reach, arrive" to the Gt form of the verb because of its sequence with mgy which is very similar in meaning. In his opinion, the second verb concludes the action of the first and thus he renders it, "Dníl reaches his palace."³ Such an analy-

¹The word divider in ym.ʿyn is probably a scribal error, since the similar passages, 2Aq:II:25 and ʿnt:II:18 have y/tmgyn without the word divider.

²UT, 494.

³It is tempting to see here, if Gordon's analysis be correct, an echo of what von Soden calls the "perfect tense" in Akkadian, i.e., the

sis is unnecessary, however, since parallel verbs with nearly identical meanings occur frequently in Ugaritic (e.g., mhs/hsh; npl/hwy, etc.). The root šql appears in Aramaic with the meaning "to take (away)," and thus the sense of the verb seems to be that Dnll takes himself to his palace.

There are a few places where the infix-t appears to lend passive force to the verb:

1. 2:16, 17, 25 (twice), 33, 34: ytšl.lab.bn.ll.ytšl.ldr.bnll = "It is (an offering) carried to the father of the gods; it is carried to the assembly of the gods." The root is ns' = "to carry."
2. Krt:8: (7) bt (8) mlk.štdb (štdb) = "the house of the king is destroyed." The root is ʔbd = "to destroy, perish."
3. Krt:24: hn.šph.yʔitbd = "Lo, the family is destroyed." The root is also ʔbd = "to destroy, perish." The phrase might also be translated in the active voice, "Lo, the family perishes." In this case, the emphatic force of the Gt would be operative, especially after the particle hn.

In the majority of occurrences of Gt forms, however, neither reflexive nor passive force appears to be indicated. Several examples are given here as illustrations of this point:

1. hlk = "to go."

49:II:15: ʔan.ʔitlk.wašd = "I went and I hunted."¹

action of the t-infix verbs complete the action of preceding verbs. Other examples of this are possible, cf. the Gt of npl used at the end of the list of disasters which occurred to the offspring of Krt (line 20) and the use of ʔbd (Gt) in line 19. There is no consistency discernible, however, and the theory can find little support elsewhere.

¹This phrase occurs elsewhere in other persons: 52:67, (ttlkn).

The context indicates that hlk should be translated in the sense of going here and there, walking aimlessly, searching.¹ This is in contrast with the general use of hlk in the G stem where the direction is almost always indicated, "he goes to Lebanon," (64:2); "they go to my house," (122:1, 9); "go, abide in the heights," (125:43, 68); "go . . . thou wilt reach Great Udm and Little Udm," (Krt:106, cf. 207), and elsewhere. In some texts hlk is used as a noun (the going of Baal, 51:II:13, 14) and with the sense of "going one's way along the road of life," e.g., "I will go blessed" (IAq:194); "I will go protected," (IAq:195). The idea of a definite direction is intended in these latter examples, and the t-forms seem to impart a sense of directionless intensity, to and fro, hither and yon, etc.

2. šm^c = "to hear."

127:29, 42: štm^c.wtq^g ūdn = "Listen and incline (your) ears."

The G occurrences of šm^c usually take direct objects and that which is heard, or to be heard, is a known person or thing, e.g., "he hears thee, O Cow" (6:22); "and now let my brother listen to my voice," (18:17), etc. Frequently the word is used in the imperative mood, e.g., "Hear, O Lady Atrt," (49:I:16); "hear me, O Aliyn Baal," (51:V:121; VI:4); "hear, I shall protect thee," (126:IV:2), and elsewhere. In every such case, the hearer is commanded to attend the speaker who gives or implies specific instructions. In the Gt, šm^c demands intensive attention, and the urgency of the demand is heightened by the additional

šd.tšd; 67:VI:26, (ttlk.wtšd), and 75:I:34 (ytlk.wyšd).

¹Aistleitner, MKT, 20, translates štlk with the German, "Ich streifte umher," that is, "to wander around."

phrase "incline thine ear." The context indicates passion and anger, and is, indeed, threatening. The t-form, again, indicates intensity, urgency in the command.

3. mhs = "to strike."

ʿnt:III:43: ʾmths w (44) ʾtrt.brs = "I fought and took possession of the gold."

49:VI:24: tmth (25) ʿfm.ʾaliyn.b^cl = "I fought with Aliyn Baal."

ʿnt:II:5: . . . tm (6) ths.b^cmq.thtšb.bn (7) grytm = "She fought in the valley;¹ She fought between the two cities."

ʿnt:II:19: wl.šb^ct.tmthšh.b^cmq = "and to satiety she smites it violently."²

ʿnt:II:23: m^cid.tmthən.wt^cn = "much she fights and sees."

ʿnt:II:29: ʿd.tšb^c.tmthš.bbt = "Until she is sated, she fights in the house."

The verb mhs is used frequently throughout Ugaritic literature in its G stem where it usually takes a direct object, e.g., "because you smote Lôtan," (67:I:1, 27); "lo, you will smite your enemies," (68:9); "she smites the people of the hp y [m] (?)," (ʿnt:II:7). It is best translated "to smite." In the Gt stem, however, this verb is intensified to the meaning of "to do battle" or "to fight."³

¹The word mq also means "strength" and the phrase may be translated, "I fought violently." See UL, 17.

²Translation of the passage is difficult. We follow UL, 18 here. Aistleitner, MUS, 301, takes šb^ct as the main verb and tmthš as a noun and renders, "und nicht wurde sie satt ihres Mordens im Tale." G. R. Driver's translation (Canaanite Myths and Legends, p. 85), "she was not sated with fighting in the vale," is well within the keeping of the sense of the passage although somewhat free.

³A root mhs occurs in Ugaritic (ʿnt:III:35, 38, 40, 42), always

4. hṣb = "to hew, cleave."

This verb appears only five times, always parallel to the verb mḥs: 131:6; 'nt:II:6, 20, 24, 30. While it never occurs in the G stem, we can be reasonably sure that its analysis parallels that of mḥs. The infix-t intensifies the action of the simple stem, from "to hew" into "to butcher, massacre."

5. ṣmr = "to look, see."

137:32: . . . yṭmr.hrb.ltšt = "he sees a striking (or polished?) sword."¹

'nt:I:22: yṭmr.b^cl (23) bnth = "Baal watches his daughters."

This verb occurs only in the Gt stem and therefore, comparison is impossible. In both of its occurrences, ṣmr is used in emotional situations. One can hardly look at a "brandished sword"² without passion. In the passage from 'nt, Baal is watching (intently) his daughters, Pdry, Tly and, presumably, Arsy, in the midst of a banquet with the attendant "wine, women and song." The whole scene is overlaid with an emotional atmosphere, and thus Baal's viewing of his daughters, who may be dancing before him, is more than casual.

6. rqṣ = "to dance (Arabic رقص), swoop (like an eagle)."³

68:15: yrtqṣ.ṣmd.bd.b^cl.km.nṣr = "The club will swoop in the hand of Baal like an eagle."

in the perfect, mḥšt. Aistleitner notes (WUS, 182) that this may be mḥšt with partial assimilation due to the adjacent t.

¹The root of ltšt appears to be ltš, in Arabic it means "to strike or beat"; in Hebrew, "to hammer, sharpen."

²UL, 14. ³UT, 486.

The Gt of rqš also occurs in similar passages in 68:13, 20, 23. The meaning of the infix-t form must again be intensive. The club is to swoop with authority and with full intent to destroy.¹

7. qns = "to go into labor."²

52:51, 58: tqtngn.wtldn = "she goes into labor and she bears."

The intensive nature of qns in the Gt is obvious here even though the root meaning may be unclear.

8. npl = "to fall."

Krt:21: (20) mšbt hn.bšlh (21) ttpl = "A seventh, lo, by the sword has fallen."

The intensive nature of the passage is confirmed by hn = "Lo, behold."³

The verb npl also occurs in the G stem, 6:13; 67:VI:8; 68:5; 75:II:37; 137:9, 15, 31. In these instances it has the meaning of the infix-t form of Krt:21.

9. hrš = "to work magic."

126:V:26: (25) . . . [ʾa]nk (26) ihtrš = "I shall work magic."⁴

The context has to do with the exorcizing of disease, and is thus understandably intensive.

10. šbm = "to muzzle."

¹Bruno W. W. Dombrowski refers to the "repeated strokes of an eagle while killing his prey with his talons," in the article, "Some Remarks on the Hebrew Hithpa'el and Inversative -T- in the Semitic Languages," JNES, 21 (1962), 231, note 11.

²UT, 479. The etymology is problematical. Aistleitner, WUS, 279, translates, "schwanger werden," still close to Gordon, however.

³Aistleitner treats mšb^cthn as one word and translates the passage, "die siebente von ihnen ist durch ein Geschoss gefallen," WUS, 302.

⁴UT, 399.

ʿnt:III:37: līštbm.tnn. ššbm[n]h = "I did indeed muzzle Tnn; yea, I muzzled him."

The verb appears also in 49:I:2, but the text is too fragmentary to shed light on the use of the verb. The ʿnt passage is a problem. Both verbs seem to indicate the same meaning, and both take direct objects. Why should the first be Gt and the second G? Because the preformative l of līštbm is asseverative, and the meaning is intensive. This would account for the use of the Gt in the first clause.

A few other verbs occur in the Gt, but they are either in broken texts, their roots or meanings are uncertain, or they fit none of the schemes above. They are the following:

1. why, or wth: "to hasten."

ʿnt:III:17; IV:56: twth.ššdk = "may your legs hasten."

If the root is why (Arabic سج) then the form is Gt, and its intensive meaning is clear.

2. tyn, or ttn = "to urinate." (55:8).

The text is fragmentary, and meaning in context is impossible. The Gt form is yttn, and intensive meaning can hardly be ascribed to it, since it is part of a medical text, and the general context is rather dry and flat. The most plausible explanation would be, in my opinion, that this is a -tan- form, expressing habitual action. This certainly is in keeping with the meaning of the verb!¹

3. npp (?) = meaning unclear.

The word tppp appears only in ʿnt:II:42: tppp.ʿanhb[m], where it is

¹Similarly, šyn/štn in Hebrew. This will be discussed in Chapter IV.

adjacent to the equally difficult 'anhb. Aistleitner takes the root of the verb to be npp, related to the Arabic naḥifa which is a pulverized medicine. He translates the passage uncertainly, "sich mit ein pulverisierten Substanz einreiben (?)." ¹ Gordon does not translate the verb form in the glossary of his Ugaritic Textbook. ²

4. In 1021:15 we find tātī or tātīg. If, as seems likely, the former is the correct form, the root may be š'1 = "to ask," as stated by Gordon, UT, 486, Aistleitner, WUS, 299. The text is too fragmentary to give us the context. The same root appears likely in 2008:rev. 10: w.mlk.yštāl = "and let the king ask." The rest of the text is broken.

5. In 52:31, 35-36, one finds mšt'ltm, mšt'ltm which Gordon derives from š'1 found in Ethiopic, meaning "to make an effigy." ³ If Gordon is correct, the form is a dual Gt participle. Aistleitner, however, derives the word from 'yl, a root in Arabic having to do with family relationships. ⁴ The form then would be Št dual participle. In any case, the use of the verb form as a noun, sheds little light on the infix-t problem.

6. The verb form yt'n of 49:VI:16 is regarded by Gordon (UT, 442) as probably the Gt of nw' = "to move": ⁵

¹WUS, 211.

²UT, 500, but see his comments and the reference cited on page 361, under the listing of 'anhb = "hare."

³UT, 493. ⁴WUS, 230.

⁵Aistleitner, WUS, 67, appears to take t'n as the root of yt'n. He refers the reader to item 1123 on page 121, but the reference in 49:VI:16 is not cited there.

yt^cn.kgarm = "they shake each other like gm—beasts."¹

If his translation be correct, this is an example of the reciprocal force of the Gt. The reflexive force is also possible, "they shake themselves."

7. The form ystrn may be the Gt of srr whose root meaning is unknown. The passage is 51:VII:47 and Gordon translates, "the Beloved meditates in his inwards."² If this is correct, this may be another example of the intensifying force of the infix-t.

8. The verb form wtqk found in parallel with tštm^c in 127:39, 42, is taken by Gordon³ as Gt of the root yqk, related to Hebrew yqs = "to awake." Aistleitner⁴ derives it from a root related to the Arabic ṣaḡa = "to bow down," and thus the form would be G. If Gordon is correct, the Gt is again intensive, paralleling the Gt of sm^c discussed above.

9. The form yttqt in 77:47-48 is too broken to determine the context with certainty. The root appears to be tqt = "to convey, pay";⁵ but it makes little sense in the passage. Aistleitner,⁶ regards it as the name of a goddess, and on the basis of parallelism, his solution is reasonable.

10. A real problem is presented by wtšttqdn in the fragmentary text, 26:7. The root is unknown, and it cannot be determined with certainty

¹UL, 48.

²UT, 452. ³UT, 414.

⁴WUS, 279. ⁵UT, 506. The etymology is not given.

⁶WUS, 141.

whether the form is Gt (of šgd) or Št (of a root containing gd; i.e., nqd, gwd, etc.). From the few translatable words, document 126 appears to be a letter, but the context of the verb in question is quite lost.

11. In a fragmentary text, 'nt pl. x:V:27 the Gt form ltptq appears. It may be derived from the root pwq = "to drink (?)." The word šttk in 75:II:58 also defies certain translation. It may be Gt of šty = "to drink" or šyt = "to place." It is even conceivably an Št form of an unknown root.

12. There are some names in Ugaritic besides the one just cited which appear to be derived from Gt formations:

a) šlthm: If this is Gt, it may mean, "I eat," or "I fight," from the root lhm. It may be, however, the combination of šl = "god" with thm = "word, message" and mean a "message of god," (321:II:5; 1125:4; 2078:13; 2085:5, 12).

b) šlthmr: The meaning is "It bears fruit," the verbal root being thmr = "to bear fruit," (300:11).

c) mttr: "The people bear fruit," (1008:2).

d) bn.šaktay: perhaps from the root kmy/h = "to be pale of face, grey, weak-eyed," (321:IV:10).

e) šlthbnm: a month name, (1099:30; 2011:1; 2012:13).

f) ymšr: derived from yšr = "to be upright," (1082:3).

g) bn.ntgm: Son of pleasure, cf. Hebrew n'm, (400:V:12).

In any case, the personal names can add little to what has already been said regarding infix-t forms. They can, however, confirm our general thesis that Gt is not primarily reflexive, and they do not

contradict our claim that the t-element indicates intensity.

The Št stem is of rather rare occurrence among the Ugaritic texts, and it is not always recognizable as we have seen above in verbs like šqd. Its most common appearance is with the verb hwy which in the Št means "to prostrate oneself":

49:I:10; 51:IV:26: wtql tšthwy = "and she falls and she prostrates herself."

129:6; 'nt pl. ix:III:25: wyql yšthwy = "and he falls and he prostrates himself."

137:15: ʔal.tpl. ʔl tšthwy; 137:31: ltpl.ltšthwy = "they do not fall and they do not prostrate themselves," (the passage in 137:15 should be translated in the imperative, "do not fall and do not prostrate yourselves," as indicated by the negative, ʔal).

The verb hwy also occurs in similar passages in 51:VIII:28; 2Aq:VI:50; 'nt pl. ix:II:16; III:7, 19-20.

In its usage the Št of hwy is clearly reflexive in force. Its liberal translation would be, "he caused himself to bow down." The verb occurs only in Št, so comparison with its meanings in other stems is impossible.

The form tšthrp in 1Aq:10 is somewhat uncertain in meaning:

1Aq:10: tšthrp.klb ʔlnm = "she puts whiteness like the hearts of the gods,"¹ or "Begierde hatte der Hund der Gottheiten."²

¹UL, 94. In UT, 399, Gordon does not give a translation of the passage.

²MUS, 107.

The root of the word may mean either "to have strong desire" or be related to the word for "potash," cf. Arabic ḥrṣ which may have either meaning. In the references just cited, both Aistleitner and Gordon note that ḥrṣ (1Aq:8; 1121:8; 1123:4, 8) appears to be a military implement and Aistleitner's "dreschlitten" seems quite reasonable.

In light of the intensive force of the Gt stems discussed above, the Aistleitner translation appears to be the more acceptable.

Perhaps, an Št form is present in tātšh, 1001:11. Its root is unknown, and the context cannot be determined, since the preceding word (šzrm = Š of zrm?) is also problematic.

To sum up the infix-t situation in Ugaritic, the forms are attested so far only in the prefix conjugation of the G and Š stems.¹ While the meaning is occasionally reflexive, passive and perhaps even reciprocal, the basic meaning seems to be intensive. That is, the action of the verb, whatever it may be, is strengthened by the addition of the infix-t. The nature of the intensity involves the total involvement of the agent, sometimes giving rise to the reflexive, the passive, or the reciprocal force of the verb. It also involves a sense of real and sometimes desperate urgency. The intensified action is directionless, or rather it may move in many directions in succession. The action may also be repetitive or durative, for certainly extent in time is implied.

¹The tD stem, which Aistleitner proposes in greater evidence than Gordon is not discussed here because it lies outside the scope of this study. It suffices to say that these forms appear to be generally reflexive in nature without the intensity of the Gt. See Joseph Aistleitner, review of C. H. Gordon's Ugaritic Grammar, Biblica, 22 (1941), 222.

To illustrate what has just been said, the verbs mhs and hsb may be used. Ordinarily, in the G stem, they mean "to strike" and "to hew, or cleave," but in the Gt the action is repetitive, in many directions at once; the blows are multiplied over a period of time, and thus the subject "fights" or "battles." The subject is also totally involved in the action. One gets the sense of near frenzy, for, indeed, life is at stake. So also the club "swoops" (rqš) in the hands of Ba'al. Its action is repeated and violent until his foe sinks to the earth and is utterly destroyed.

In worship, also, the total person must be involved in a state of urgency, or perhaps even ecstasy. Thus, he prostrates himself (hwy), and his washing (rhš) is preparation is careful and performed with a depth of devotion.

Likewise, one is commanded to make his legs hasten (why), and he is commanded to listen (šm') and be alert (yqg) totally, for his very life depends upon it. Childbearing certainly involves the entire being of the woman, and her travail (qnš) is one of deep emotional stress, as well as physical agony. One looks (ʔmr) at a brandished sword or at dancing women at the height of a banquet with more than casual interest. One walks (hlk) briskly over hill and dale, searching, roaming, seeking. And, if we may belabor the point, the root ty becomes itn because of the urgency in man's need to divest himself of water, one of his bodily processes.

Perhaps the most illustrative example of the use of infix-t is in the word, ʔhtrš, which means, "I shall work magic." The form

conjures up the classic picture of the ancient seer, totally involved in his enchantment, writhing, twisting and turning in his ecstatic trance in which all the powers of deity are his, and he holds the very future of his people in the palm of his hand.¹

The only use of infix-t not explained by the thesis of the intensive t-element is perhaps the passive, although it cannot be denied that passive and reflexive force are closely allied.² Since an internal passive is established in Ugaritic,³ it is possible that the Gt forms of ns², and bd are passive not because of the "t" but because of the internal vowel structure.

Infix-t forms occur in three other ancient Semitic languages besides the ones already discussed here. The number of the examples available is quite small, but they are worthy of note.

¹The intensive force is also, of course, expressed by the D stem whereby the second root letter is doubled, and certain internal vowel changes take place. The D stem actually only represents orthographically the stress or emphasis put upon the spoken word, i.e., emphasis upon the word thus emphasizes its meaning. This intensity is really intensity expressed by vocal inflection. The addition of a t-element infixed into the root expresses a much deeper degree of intensity than the D stem. The D stem may have other meanings and may even be primarily factitive (ICGSL, 124). We do not, however, agree with A. Poebel's statement ["Notes on the Pi'el and Saf'el-Pi'el," *Studies in Akkadian Grammar*, AS No. 9 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 65] that "the pi'el formation basically denotes intensity is quite erroneous. Indeed, not one single case where the pi'el unmistakably has this meaning is to be found in any of the Semitic languages."

²The alliance of passive and reflexive forces are illustrative in languages other than the Semitic. German, for example, uses the same construction to express both meanings. Sich öffnen may mean "to open itself" or "to be opened."

³UT, 80-81.

The first of these languages is Phoenician, in which the infix-t forms are all from ancient inscriptions from Byblos.¹ As in Ugaritic, only the prefix conjugation is attested.² The constructions in question are found twice in the inscription on the Abīram sarcophagus, which is dated ca. 825 B.C.³ They are the following:

Line 2: . . . thtsp.htr.mšp̄h.thtpk.ks'.mlkh . . . = "The scepter of his rule shall be broken, the throne of his dominion shall be overturned."⁴
thtsp: The root is hsp which is otherwise not attested. It is probably related to the Hebrew hšp = "to break," Akkadian hasāpu = "to destroy."⁵
thtpk: The root hpk appears in Akkadian, Aramaic, Arabic, Ugaritic, etc., and means "to turn, overturn, upset." The meaning is clearly passive, for the words htr and ks' are feminine as are the verb forms, but it is noteworthy that the intensive force seen in Ugaritic could also be operable here. The inscription first states the names of the maker and

¹GPL, 43; PPG, 53.

²For a bibliography of the Abīram inscription, see Frank Moore Cross, Jr., and David Noel Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1952), p. 11, note 1; ANET, 504.

³The dating is Cross and Freedman's, (Early Hebrew Orthography, p. 11).

⁴This is the translation of C. C. Torrey, "The Abīram Inscription of Byblos," JAOs, 45 (1925), 269-279. W. F. Albright, "The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Tenth Century B.C. from Byblus," JAOs, 67 (1947), 155, translates the phrase in the jussive, "let his judicial scepter be broken, let his royal throne be overthrown." The translation of L. H. Vincent, "Les fouilles de Byblos, 2. L'inscription phenicienne," Revue Biblique, 34 (1925), 183-193, is similar. Pierre Montet, Byblos et L'Egypte (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1928), 215-238, translates the phrase in the future tense, "le sceptre de son pouvoir sera brisé, le trône de la royauté se renversera." For other translations see Torrey, "The Abīram Inscription," 271.

⁵Vincent, "Les fouilles," 186. Torrey adds the Arabic hsf which means to break, often by cracking, ("The Abīram Inscription," 273).

and the man buried within it, and then turns to threaten anyone who molests the tomb. The infix-t forms are included in the climax of that threat, perhaps including the t-element in intensifying that warning.

This is admittedly scant evidence for the possible conclusion just drawn, but it remains a distinct possibility, nevertheless. Albright and others¹ have pointed out the similarity between this passage and the Ugaritic passage of 49:VI:28-29:

lyhpl.ks².mlkk (29) lytbr.ḥt.mtpk: "May he overturn the throne of your kingship; may he break the staff of your sovereignty."

Note the asseverative "l" prefixed to each verb which also indicates emphasis. Evidence of the asseverative "l" (as also for the negative la²) is lacking in Phoenician. It is not unreasonable to postulate the substitution of infix-t for asseverative "l."

Torrey³ sees a probable example of infix-t in the Kilamûwa Stele.⁴ In line 10 the word ytln occurs which he emends to ytlnk, deriving the word from hlk and translating "has gone about."⁵ The form would be, as Albright points out,⁶ yhtlnk > ytlnk, but in the same

¹W. F. Albright, "Phoenician Inscriptions," 156, note 25.

²PPG, 114.

³Torrey, "The Aḥiram Inscription," 273.

⁴For a bibliography of the Kilamûwa Inscription, see Cross and Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography, p. 11, note 2.

⁵C. C. Torrey, "The Zakar and Kalamu Inscription," JAOS, 35 (1915), 367. See Mark Lidzbarski, Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik, III, pp. 218-238, especially pp. 233, 237.

⁶W. F. Albright, "Notes on Early Hebrew and Aramaic Epigraphy," JPOS, 6 (1926), 84-85.

article, Albright derives the word from the root lwn and translates the passage, "(they) writhed like dogs."¹ Others² derive the word from different roots, but its form is (h)itpa^cal, correctly transliterated yitlawwun,³ and it cannot be classed as an infix-t construction.

No other examples of infix-t constructions are known in Phoenician. It is to be noted, as has been remarked earlier, that a hitpa^cel form also occurs in this language along with the infix-t and hitpa^cal forms just cited. The location is in the Neo-Punic Bir-Tlesla inscription,⁴ line 1, where we find htqds = "he sanctified himself." Other hitpa^cel forms are not known.

The second language is Moabite, attested in the Mesha inscription which was discovered before 1868 by Clermont-Ganneau and has since been studied by numerous scholars.⁵ Its authenticity has been most recently established by Albright⁶ in answer to an article by A. S. Yahuda⁷ which

¹Ibid., 85.

²F. E. Peiser, "Die neue Inschrift aus Sendschirli," OLZ, 12 (1911), 542, derives the root from lwh "in Sinne von sich vor der Berührung hüten." Benno Landsberger, Sam^aal I (Ankara: Druckerie der Turkischen historischen Gesellschaft, 1948), p. 53, sees the root as lwn = "nachtigen."

³Albright, "Notes," 85; Cross and Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography, p. 18.

⁴Lidzbarski, Ephemeris, III, 287-290; PPG, 32; GPL, 42.

⁵For the bibliography see Cross and Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography, p. 35; ANET, 320.

⁶W. F. Albright, "Is the Mesha Inscription a Forgery?", JQR, 35 (1944-1945), 247-250.

⁷A. S. Yahuda, "The Story of a Forgery and the Mesha Inscription," JQR, 35 (1944-1945), 139-164.

declared the inscription a forgery. Its date, ca. 835 B.C., is also now rather generally accepted.

Infix-t forms of the root lhm occur on lines 11, 15 (w'lthm), 19 (bhlthmh), and 32 (hlthm). There is general agreement on the translation, "to fight,"² and in each case the verb takes a following preposition b, best translated as "against." In the very limited amount of Moabite material available, we have no other examples of infix-t stems, nor do we have any other Moabite uses of the verb lhm with which comparisons could be made. It is to be pointed out, of course, that verbs with similar meaning in Ugaritic (mhs, hpb) also occur in infix-t forms.

With due regard to the limited number of examples from which to draw conclusions, the use of infix-t for intensifying purposes is a possible explanation of its appearance. Naturally, it is also possible that by the time of the Mesha inscription, the forms with infix-t had crystallized so that usage without it was not known. This is what seems to have happened in Hebrew where, with few exceptions, only the niph'al stem of lhm = "to fight," is known.³

¹Cross and Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography, p. 35. See also the brief discussion of date in ANET, 320.

²"Kämpfen, streiten": R. Smend and A. Socin, Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab (Freiburg: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung von J. C. B. Mohr, 1886). "To fight": G. A. Cook, A Text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), pp. 1-14; S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890), pp. lxxxv-xciv; and W. F. Albright, ANET, 320-321. "Attaquer, combattre": René Dussaud, Les Monuments palestiniens et judaïques (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1912), pp. 1-22.

³The only occurrences of lhm in the gal are found in Ps. 35:1 and 56:2, 3. In the former, M. Dahood, Psalms I, p. 210, notes the article by Albright JPOS, 14 (1934), where the similarity between the Ugaritic ²imhs mhs ³ahy (1Aq:196) and Ps. 35:1. Perhaps there is a relationship

In the third language, Amorite, Huffmon¹ finds three names which he believes are derived from infix-t forms. They are the following:

1. Ha-am-mi-iš-ta-mar: The h- is cuneiform for ^ʿ and the name is probably in two parts, ^ʿm viš-tamar and means, "the people will bear fruit."

The root, according to Huffmon, is tmr.²

2. Ya-an-ta-qí-im = yantaqim. The meaning is probably, "He will take vengeance."

3. Ta-ab-ta-mar = tahtamar, probably ta^ʔtamar, meaning, "She will look."

In this case the cuneiform -h represents the glottal stop. The root ʔmr = "to see" is probably better (in light of the Ugaritic verb which also occurs in the Gt) than mr = "to say." The latter is certainly possible, however.³

It must be noted that the first and last names include verbal roots which are not only found in Ugaritic, but also occur in the Gt. Even in this limited evidence there is support for the theory of the intensifying infix-t. ʔmr has already been discussed in the section on Ugaritic Gt; tmr was discussed briefly under the Ugaritic names ʿmtmr

between the non-t-infix of the Ugaritic verbs and the non-niph^ʿal construction of the Hebrew verbs. In Ps. 56:2, 3, Dahood, Psalms II (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1968), p. 42, emends the text to read lēḥēm (not lōḥēm) and translates, "with both jaws." This leaves only the word lōḥamīm in Ps. 56:3 which is a nominal, not a verbal form.

¹Herbert B. Huffmon, Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), pp. 81-82.

²Ibid.

³Huffmon (p. 81) indicates a possible Gt name in the form ya-ab-ta-ha-ar-na.

and ilṭmr, but it may be added here that the act of bearing fruit is one fraught with emotional overtones, easily lending itself to intensive qualification. Similarly, ngm = "to take vengeance" is a word which one may easily wish to intensify.

Finally, it should be mentioned that one word in the Canaanite glosses of the el-Amarna tablets appears in the Gt stem:

280:25: yi-iš-ta-al šarru be-li: "Let the king, my lord, ask (himself)."¹

The usage appears to be purely reflexive, but there is still a note of real urgency in the request. Šuwardata is pleading with the king for just treatment to sustain his right to his own city. The verbal root s¹l may also appear in Ugaritic, in 1021:15, as we have seen above.

In the other Semitic languages, there is broad use of a prefixed-t to express the reflexive force of the verb, but in none of them do we find clear infix-t constructions. In the Aramaic dialects, the reflexive stem is expressed by the addition of ʔt or ht prefixed to the verbal root:² ʔitp^cel-hitp^cel; ʔtpa^cal-hitpa^cal. The š causative also occurs on rare occasions, hištap^cal, but this appears to be due to later Akkadian influence.³ In Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, we find ʔitp^cel, ʔitpa^cal, and ʔittap^cal.⁴ In Syriac, the form is ʔetpe^cel, and it has

¹J. A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna Tafeln, p. 849; cf. Harris, Development, p. 62, and the references cited there; Samuel A. B. Mercer, The Tell el-Amarna Tablets (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1939), pp. 695-696.

²Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen (Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927), pp. 90-94.

³Richardson, A Practical Handbook, p. 25; Franz Rosenthal, A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961), p. 53.

⁴William B. Stevenson, Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic

primarily passive force, although its meaning is not limited to this.¹

Several languages of North Africa also use the t-element to express various modes of reflexiveness. In Ethiopic the prefix is usually ta² as follows:

III, 1	taqatla	IV, 1	'astaqtala
III, 2	taqattala	IV, 2	'astaqattala
III, 3	taqatala	IV, 3	'astaqatala

As with other languages, the prefix-t stems have a wide range of meanings besides the reflexive, e.g., passive, denominative, reciprocal, etc.

Regarding Negro-African languages, Castellino has shown that there is much similarity between the verbal systems of some languages of North Africa and those of the Akkadian dialects.³ In these dialects, the t-element has a very wide range of meanings, and its position within the root varies from language to language. Most often, it appears as a suffix "-at," e.g., in Somali,⁴ Sidamo,⁵ Bedawye,⁶ but also as a prefix (Tuareg⁷ and sometimes in Bedawye⁸), and infix as in Galla.⁹ These forms

(Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924), pp. 44-46. Occasional 'istp'al forms are found also.

¹L. H. Brockington, Syriac Grammar (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 62-64.

²EG, 151-160.

³Castellino, The Akkadian Personal Pronouns, especially the summary, pp. 139-150.

⁴Ibid., 107. ⁵Ibid., 105.

⁶Ibid., 107-108. ⁷Ibid., 109.

⁸Ibid., 108. ⁹Ibid., 106.

have a basic reflexive-passive meaning, but they can also range to reciprocal, intensive-frequentive, and causative meanings and can even express centripetal movement.¹

In Akkadian and Negro-African languages, Castellino sees that

ta forms represent essentially an interest of the speaker for the action and this interest may be direct or indirect (reflexive or medial) and assume other nuances according to the basic values of the root, if active verbs or denominative verbs.

It cannot be denied that there is a strong subjective aspect in the use of infix-t forms in Akkadian, and to this should be added the language of Ugaritic as has been shown. On the basis of very meagre evidence, Phoenician, Moabite and Amorite may be tentatively included in the list.

The origin of infix-t forms may be reconstructed in the following way: In Proto-Semitic, or perhaps one of its precursors, the t-element, which appeared earliest as an infix form, expressed total personal involvement in the action of the verb. This action involved a profound sense of urgency, anxiety or other emotional stress upon the part of the subject. The process or the outcome of the action was of high importance to him, whether it was a petition to his god, or an angry foray against his enemy. The action was never momentary, but because of its intensity, it continued over a period of time, and it often called for repeated movement without specific direction, i.e., it could move in several different directions at once or successively.

As a result, and depending upon the nature of the verb itself, the infix-t could express reflexive force, bringing the benefits of the action back to the actor. It could also indicate middle and passive

¹Ibid., 132-133.

²Ibid., 137.

voice as well as reciprocal action. The repeated, multi-directional movement of the verb could lead to iterative, durative, habitative, and separative force. Infix-t is not simple change in direction (the richtungsändernde of von Soden¹) but indication of action in several directions, sometimes toward the agent, sometimes away from him, sometimes vacillating back and forth, to and from him, sometimes in aimless meandering, sometimes in circular motion around him. While the t-form most frequently involves highly subjective action, like fighting, striking, exacting vengeance, working magic, etc., it may even take common action like seeing, asking, and walking and lift it to a highly intense, emotional, subjective plane.

To be sure, it is always dangerous to generalize, but the preceding explanation of the various meanings expressed by t-forms covers most of the usages of these forms in the Semitic and even the Hamito-Semitic languages. As is to be expected, each of the languages developed its own peculiar and individual characteristics, both in morphology and meaning. In Akkadian only infix-t forms were employed which were developed to a higher degree than in the other languages. The usage was extended to include perfective force, completing a series of actions and serving as the climax thereof. To the simple -ta- was added an n, or the infix was doubled by adding a second 'ta.' Arabic added prefix-t forms to its repertoire, perhaps in analogy with the pronominal prefixes of the prefix conjugation, and the meanings of both forms became chiefly reflexive-passive-medial with vestiges of other connotations

¹GAG, 120.

remaining. Ugaritic remains closest of the known languages to Proto-Semitic with regard to many aspects of the infix-t usage, and from it we derive the best knowledge of its primitive functions. Some languages of North Africa also retain many of the early functions of the t-element and express them morphologically in a number of ways, i.e., suffix, prefix, and/or infix.

Sometime, probably during the first millennium B.C., the infix-t forms were generally supplanted by prefix-t forms, again probably because of the extensive use of the pronominal t-elements as preformatives in verbal forms. Thus the more recent languages, such as the dialects of Aramaic and Ethiopic, do not evidence infix-t forms at all. The position of Hebrew in this scheme is uncertain, and to this we now turn our attention.

CHAPTER IV

INFIX-T FORMS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

Infix-t constructions are neither a common nor an obvious feature of Biblical Hebrew. None of the standard Hebrew grammars list them among the forms of the Hebrew verbal stems, and even the comparative Semitic grammars, including the most recent ones, disallow the possibility of such forms in the MT.

The most widely accepted of all Hebrew grammars, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, fails to mention the possibility of infix-t constructions in Biblical Hebrew and lists only the reflexive prefix-t stems, the hitpa'el, the rare hotpa'al, and the also rare hitpo'el.¹ The author and revisers of this grammar equate the hitpa'el with the Arabic VIII, infix-t, conjugation and with the infix-t of the Moabite inscription.²

Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander list the reflexive conjugations as hitpa'el, hatpa'al, hitpo'el, hitpa'lel, hitpalpel, and even a nitpa'el.³ To these forms, besides reflexive meanings, they ascribe also reciprocal and passive meanings,⁴ but they do not discuss infix-t forms.

¹GHG, 116.

²Ibid., 151.

³HGHS, 288.

⁴Ibid., 290-291.

Jouön's more recent work¹ has little to add to what had already been said by the earlier authors. It describes the hitpa^cel as the reflexive of the pi^cel² and thus equates it with the Dt (or tD) of Ugaritic or the V form of Arabic.

Among the comparative grammars, only Brockelmann allows for any possibility of infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew, and this only as a possible secondary development in the verbal root syn.³ Moscati mentions only prefix-t forms in Hebrew while he acknowledges infix-t forms in other Semitic languages.⁴ Garbini discusses infix-t in the oldest Phoenician inscriptions from Byblos and in Moabite of the ninth century B.C., but denies the existence of these forms in Biblical Hebrew:

Tale riduzione investe del resto anche gli altri dialetti del primo millenio, come si vede dal fatto che, mentre il moabitico del IX secolo a. Cr. conserva ancora il tema riflessivo con t infissa, questo è ormai scomparso in ebraico.⁵

Certainly it must be concluded that there are no easily recognizable infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew as we now have it represented in the MT. Still, as Cross and Freedman have commented,⁶ the attested languages of the late second—early first millennia, which were in geographic proximity to the Israelites, did contain such forms. As dis-

¹Paul Jouön, Grammaire de l'Hebreu biblique (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1947).

²Ibid., 120. ³GVG, 530.

⁴ICGSL, 127-129.

⁵Garbini, Il Semitico, p. 130.

⁶Cross and Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," 200, note 16. See page 2 above for the quotation.

cussed above, Chapter III, the forms were present in Akkadian, Ugaritic, Phoenician, Amorite and Moabite. While we have no documents of Arabic origin before the last half of the first millennium, we can be certain that the VIII and X forms were used in much earlier times. It would be strange indeed if the Hebrew language of the earlier strata of the Old Testament did not employ infix-t constructions in its verbal system. It may be hypothesized that if such forms were present in the early language of the Hebrews, they gradually passed from common usage during the first millennium until the later scribes, including the Masoretes, neither understood nor recognized the forms where they occurred in the sacred literature. Accordingly, the text was emended, or the oral tradition was "corrected" to reflect the later understanding of the language. It has long been recognized that the MT basically reflects one rather late dialect of Hebrew, and while some archaic forms remain, the language of the MT is surprisingly uniform, in spite of the fact that its contents span more than one thousand years of history.¹

Over the years, bit by bit, evidence has been building to support the theory that infix-t forms were used in Early Biblical Hebrew.

¹GHG, 10-11. E. Ullendorff, "Biblical Languages, A. Old Testament Languages," A Companion to the Bible, ed. by T. W. Manson and newly ed. by H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), pp. 12-13, states, "There is no discernible development in the Massoretic pronunciation of Hebrew, and the vocalism applied to the consonants makes Deborah talk in very much the same manner as Daniel or Esther almost a thousand years later."

The Qumran material indicates that scribes made frequent changes in texts when copying. See particularly, Bleddyn J. Roberts, "Text, OT," IDB, vol. R-Z, 580-594. Professor Frank Moore Cross, Jr., tells me that he notes many deliberate changes made by Qumran scribes to up-date the language, e.g., the out-dated עלמח "his youth," is replaced by the then-more-common ׀ללח with the same meaning.

The earliest recognition of such a form, of which I am aware, is in William Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon of 1844.¹ Under the place name אֶשְׁחָמָה (אֶשְׁחָמוֹר) found in Jos. 15:50; 21:14; 1 Sam. 30:28; 1 Chr. 4:17, we find the notation, "as if Inf. of Arab. Conj. VIII, from r. שָׁמַע." A somewhat similar notation is found on the same page under אֶשְׁחָאֵל (Jud. 13:25; 16:31; 18:2, 8, 11; אֶשְׁחָאוֹר Jos. 15:33; 19:41, and the gentilic, אֶשְׁחָאֵלִי, 1 Chr. 2:53). C. F. Burney in 1912² confirmed this interpretation and added to the list אֶלְחָקָא (= אֶלְחָקָה) of Jos. 19:44; 21:23, אֶלְחָקָא of Jos. 15:59 and אֶלְחָלִיד of Jos. 15:30. He noted that in "Babylonian," אֶשׁ" often becomes "אֶל"³ and the forms then become "Istaph'al," i.e., St. Burney noted that several of these place names appear to be connected with local sanctuaries, and he translated them as follows:

אֶשְׁחָמָה from the root שָׁמַע = "to hear," = "Place where prayer is heard."

אֶשְׁחָאֵל from the root שָׁאַל = "to ask," = "Place of consulting the oracle."

אֶלְחָלִיד: (אֶשְׁחָלִיד): from the Arabic root وَلِد = "to get with child," "Place of attaining children."

אֶלְחָקָא: (אֶשְׁחָקָא): from the root אָקַה = "to give to drink," = "Watering place." Burney noted that an Arabic root لָق occurs in the VIII

¹William Gesenius, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, trans. by Edward Robinson (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1944), p. 103.

²C. F. Burney, "On Certain Palestinian Place-Names," JTS, 23 (1912), 83-84.

³See GAG, 116. This phenomenon occurs usually in middle/late Babylonian and always in middle Assyrian.

Conjugation, ²iltaga, and the name may then mean, "Place of combat."

אלחקן: (<אשחקן): Cannot be translated since no root אקן or לקן is known.

Hans Bauer,¹ James Montgomery,² Cross and Freedman³ have all agreed upon the infix-t character of several of the place names just described. G. R. Driver has recently discussed them in detail,⁴ confirming what has already been said, including Burney's interpretation of אלחולד, but deriving אלחקא from an Arabic root and translating it, "(place of) getting prompt information (from a god)."⁵

The forms of the place names, אשחמל and אשחמל, are certainly infix-t forms of the verbs שאל and שמע, respectively.⁶ As noted in the previous chapter, both roots occur in the Gt in Ugaritic. It is quite possible that אלחקא and אלחקן are also infix-t, but אלחולד, if drawn from wld, appears to be a prefix-t form.

The origin of these place names is probably not Hebrew, since, according to the accounts in Joshua and Judges, the cities appear to

¹Hans Bauer, "Die hebräischen Eigennamen als sprachliche Erkenntnisquelle," ZAW, 48 (1936), 77. See also HGHS, 281.

²James A. Montgomery, "Some Oracle Place Names," JBL, 54 (1935), 61-62.

³Cross and Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," 200.

⁴G. R. Driver, "Problems of the Hebrew Text and Language," Alttestamentliche Studien, Studies in honor of Friedrich Nötscher (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1950), pp. 58-59.

⁵Ibid., 59.

⁶The question of metathesis must, of course, be discussed later in this chapter. It may suffice for the moment to note that the names may well be Arabic in origin and metathesis of t and š does not ordinarily take place in that language.

have been already in existence at the time of the Israelite conquest of Palestine. They probably bore Canaanite, or, according to Driver,¹ Arabic names, or even Akkadian names in light of the change št > lt.

Another early allusion to infix-t forms is the mention of the Hebrew verb לָשׁוּׁ by Carl Brockelmann in his Grundriss.² He sees the possibility of a G reflexive in לָשׁוּׁׁׁ לָשׁוּׁׁׁׁ = "one who urinates against a wall," (1 Sam. 25:22, 34; 1 K. 14:10; 16:11; 21:21; 2 K. 9:8), לָשׁוּׁׁׁׁׁ being related to לָשׁוּׁׁׁׁׁׁ (2 K. 18:27, and with different pointing, Is. 36:12), and both from the root לָשׁוּׁׁ. Rather than accept this explanation, however, Brockelmann suggests that לָשׁוּׁׁׁׁׁׁ may be an Akkadian loan-word, šīnatu = "urine," or from īstin = "to urinate." He concedes, too, the possibility that the form might be a true hitpa^cel and that it should be transliterated maštiyyn.

Bauer and Leander call לָשׁוּׁׁׁׁׁׁ the "t-Reflexiv vom qal (Hitpa^cel),"³ and comment that the proposal of a secondary stem, לָשׁוּׁׁׁ, is not necessary. לָשׁוּׁׁׁ is listed, however, as a secondary root in Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon.

Some of the authors just mentioned apparently consider the infix-t of maštin the result of metathesis, i.e., the transposition of "š" and "t," but this is not the case. The root is šyn as it occurs in Hebrew, Akkadian, and Ugaritic. The t is infix in the root to indicate the

¹Driver, "Problems of the Hebrew Text," p. 58. BDB notes, "Perhaps Arabic-speaking tribes may have settled in parts of S. of Judah."

²GVG, 530.

³HQHS, 405. See also Hans Bauer, "Die hebräischen Eigennamen," 77.

⁴BDB, 1010.

habitative (or intensive) force of the act, and the form becomes a true Gt. This is confirmed by the fact that in Akkadian where metathesis of "g" and "t" does not ordinarily take place, the verb appears in both the G and Gt. Similarly in Ugaritic is found the Gt: ytn, (55:8 and possibly, 67:IV:19).¹

Certain forms of the Hebrew word תפח have also been seen as t forms of the Ground (or qal) stem. תפח (Jud. 20:15, 17), is commented upon by Broekelmann and called the reflexive of the Ground stem, similar to the Moabite hlthm where metathesis has occurred between the "l" and "t."² Bauer and Leander add תפח (Jud. 21:9), and תפח (Jud. 20:15) and call them forms of the hitpa'el.³ Gesenius-Kautzsch retain the designation hitpa'el, stating that the doubling of the second root letter is "abnormally omitted."⁴ Similar forms, תפח occur in Num. 1:47; 2:33; 26:62; 1 K. 20:27, and what has just been said applies to these also.

While the forms of תפח just discussed are not infix-t stems, they do serve as fairly certain proof that a t-form of the Ground stem did at one time exist in Hebrew; a tG form is here represented. It would not be unreasonable to hypothesize that the forms were originally Gt, corresponding to the similar stems in the other Semitic languages, but that the "t" became prefixed by analogy to the other prefixed-t stems in Biblical Hebrew. This event may have even been forced by scribes who did not recognize תפח and thus changed it to what they considered a

¹UT, 502. ²GVC, 530-531.

³HGHS, 281. ⁴GHG, 151.

more correct תפקד

Albright has alluded to possible infix-t forms in the Hebrew verb tr.¹ In a discussion of the Ugaritic mythological text, 51:IV:39, he translates the verb rr as "help," deriving the meaning from the Hebrew atar, "to pray for help." The verb appears also in the nip'al, ne'tar = "to be entreated, to have mercy on." Albright notes that the same root appears in the Akkadian, na'ruru = "to go to someone's help"; and in a later note,² he discusses the occurrence of rr in the Amorite name, Hadad-na'rari (Akkadian spelling nahraru). The relationship of rr: i'tarra (Arab. VIII): tr is paralleled by the Arabic dd: i'tadda: td.³

The most recent survey of the study of infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew is the rather short but comprehensive passage in "The Blessing of Moses" written some years ago by Frank Moore Cross, Jr., and David Noel Freedman.⁴ They review, briefly, the infix-t place names אשחמל and אשחאל, the notes by Albright, the use of משחין, the Št form השחורה,⁵ and draw an analogy with the infix-t forms of לחם in the Mesha inscription. On the basis of evidence gathered, they hypothesize a tenth century Hebrew higtatal conjugation, the pre-formative h arising by analogy with the

¹W. F. Albright, "The North Canaanite Poems of Aly'êyân Ba'al," JPOS, 14 (1934), 122, note 105. I am grateful to Prof. Albright for calling these to my attention.

²W. F. Albright, "New Light on the History of Western Asia in the Second Millennium B.C.," BASOR, 78 (1940), 24, note 5.

³Albright, "North Canaanite Poems," 122, note 105.

⁴Cross and Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," 200-201.

⁵Ibid., 201.

hip^cil, hitpa^cel, etc.

The point of departure for the discussion of infix-t forms in the Cross and Freedman article is the occurrence of the words הִתְכַּנּוּ in Dt. 33:3, generally translated, "they prostrated themselves." The root of the word הִתְכַּנּוּ has long been in doubt. Cross and Freedman suggest emendation of the text by considering the two words as one, הִתְכַּנּוּ = "they prostrated themselves," (probably vocalized hintakku) from the root mk (mwk or mkk) meaning "to bend, be brought low."¹ The root is found in Hebrew (Ps. 106:43; Eccl. 10:18; Job 24:24), Aramaic, Ugaritic and Arabic.

The Cross and Freedman analysis appears correct even though no other infix-t examples of mk can be found in the Hebrew Bible. The later scribes, misunderstanding the form, separated the elements הִת and כַּנּוּ, since they preferred to have at least one understandable element rather than one unknown word appearing in a very strange construction.

For the past several years, Fr. Mitchell Dahood has repeatedly called attention to the possible use of infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew. In a study of Jeremiah 18:14-15,² he analyzes the word שָׁכַח (vs. 14) as an infix-t form of the root שָׁח = "to forget." The word has usually been taken as a form of שָׁחַ = "to pluck up,"³ and Kittel⁴ suggests emendation

¹For another possibility, see J. T. Milik, "Deux documents inédits du Desert de Juda," Biblica, 38 (1957), 252, note 2. The author derives the word הִתְכַּנּוּ from a root תְּכַנ and translates, "Ils se pressent." He acknowledges, however, that the Cross and Freedman proposal is "aussi satisfaisant."

²Mitchell Dahood, "Philological Notes on Jer. 18:14-15," ZAW, 74 (1962), 207-209.

³MT, 738.

⁴Dahood, "Philological Notes," 207.

to **נִשְׁחַר**, from the root **נִשָּׁח** = "to be dry." The Hebrew passage follows:

היעזב מצור שדי שלב לכנון
אם ינחשו מיד זרים קרים נוזלים
כי שכחני עמי לשוא יקטרו

Dahood's translation is:

Do flints leave the field, snow Lebanon?

Or do men forget flowing waters, running springs?

Yet my people has forgotten me, to nullities they burn incense.¹

On the basis of parallelism, Dahood's case is strong. **נִשָּׁח** then parallels both **עָזַב** = "to forsake" which precedes it, and **שָׁכַח** = "to forget" which follows it. The other occurrences of **נִשָּׁח** in Biblical Hebrew (Gen. 41:51; Job 11:6; 39:17; Is. 44:21; Jer. 23:39; Lam. 3:17) are clearly non-infix-t constructions, and the three appearances of the root **נִשָּׁח** (Is. 19:5; 41:17; Jer. 51:20) are certainly to be translated, "to dry up" and cannot be construed as metathesized infix-t forms of **נִשָּׁח**.

The question of why the infix-t form is used in this passage and in no other must be raised. It can be answered by recognizing the fact that this passage is part of a threat spoken by God in anger, and thus quite in keeping with the intensifying force of the infix-t. Because the passage is poetry, the original form may have been retained to preserve the meter.

In the same article, Dahood proposes to explain the word **נִשְׁחַרָה** in Prov. 27:15 as an infix-t construction of the root **שָׁח** in the nip^cal stem (Nt). The passage is as follows:

¹Dahood, "Philological Notes," 207.

דלף טורד כיום סגריר

ראשית מדונים נשתורה

Kittel¹ suggests emendation to נשתורה to account for the fact that the "t" appears to be misplaced. The meaning of the passage remains basically unchanged whichever form be accepted. The infix-t would lend a greater intensity, "a continual dripping on a rainy day and a contentious woman are (surely) alike." שורה appears elsewhere in the MT only in the gal or pi'el, and thus affords no further evidence to the case in point. Since emendation must always be undertaken reluctantly and with caution, and since there is a perfectly logical solution at hand, we suggest the word נשתורה be retained as it is, and that it be regarded as infix-t. The retention of the form was due, in all probability, to its inclusion in a poetic passage.

In several recent articles,² Dahood has drawn attention to the expression פניסוה which appears many times in the Old Testament. He notes that "the LXX has translated hiatir . . . by a form of 'apostrophein, which normally translates sur, 'to turn aside.'"³ In another review he remarks that the phrase is "usually rendered in this way by the LXX and Vulgate which evidently saw the root swr in the verbal form."⁴

¹MT, 1188. See also HQHS, 426 and GHG, 212, where emendation is also suggested.

²Mitchell Dahood, "Some Remarks on a Recent Publication," Orientalia, 34 (1965), 36; review of Il Semitico de Nord-Ovest, by Giovanni Garbini, Orientalia, 32 (1963), 498-500; Psalms I, XXXVIII.

³Dahood, review of Il Semitico di Nord-Ovest, 499.

⁴Dahood, "Some Remarks," 38.

The root of סָתַר has generally been taken as derived from a root סָתַר = "to hide," and the form is thus the causative, hip^cil. סָתַר is usually rendered by $\kappaρυπτω$ in the LXX and abscondo in the Vulgate (Gen. 4:14; 1 Sam. 20:5, 24, etc.), and this holds true for the word סָתַר except in the expression סָתַר פָּנָיו (or פָּנָיו , etc.) where the Greek almost invariably translates with a form of $\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\acute{\rho}\epsilon\phi\omega$,¹ and the meaning must be, "to turn away (his) face," (Ex. 3:6; Dt. 31:17, 18, etc.). Actually, the Vulgate uses abscondo more often than averto and in the expression סָתַר פָּנָיו either verb may be found, thus, abscondo in Ex. 3:6; Dt. 31:17; Is. 54:8; 57:17, etc.; averto in Is. 50:6; Ps. 10:11; 13:2; 22:25, etc. The Vulgate does not appear to be very strongly influenced by the LXX, for there appears to be no correlation between $\kappaρυπτω$ and abscondo:averto. LXX passages containing $\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\acute{\rho}\epsilon\phi\omega$ may be rendered in the Vulgate by either abscondo (Ex. 3:6; Dt. 31:17; Is. 8:17, etc.) or by averto (Is. 50:6; Ps. 10:11; 13:2, etc.). In sum, the Greek translates the expression סָתַר פָּנָיו almost without exception by $\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\acute{\rho}\epsilon\phi\omega$, but the Latin may use either abscondo or averto without discernible cause. This would indicate that if the translators of the Septuagint and Jerome understood the form of סָתַר as infix-t, their understandings were not always the same. It appears that the LXX does have a clear understanding that the root of the word here in question is undoubtedly סָתַר and must have thus recognized its infix-t character. Jerome apparently did not understand the phenomenon, and, drawing from several sources, he translated inconsistently. In any case, the un-

¹The only exceptions to this are found in Job 13:24; 34:29, where $\kappaρυπτω$ is employed.

pointed orthography would give no clear indication of the true form. Only the correct vocalization may have distinguished infix-t from the hip^cil.

The foregoing surveys that which has been written to date on the subject of infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew. The rather small number of examples of possible forms indicates not only the need for further work, but also the extreme difficulty involved in disentangling these forms from the regular corpus of biblical material. Only those forms exist now which the scribes allowed to remain in the text because they either did not understand them at all or else understood them to be other forms which they could recognize and understand. Thus a careful search of the analytical lexicons of Mandelkern¹ and Davidson² yields no positive results, and other means of locating infix-t forms must be employed.

Therefore, before commenting further on examples already proposed, or proposing new examples, some guidelines for the study should be indicated:

1. The study would be comparatively easy if there were a clear-cut, unambiguous meaning which could be ascribed to infix-t forms, but as we have seen, the general character of these forms as displayed by Ugaritic, at least, is intense, urgent, emotional. The action indicated is intensified by repetition and/or duration, sometimes seemingly a state of

¹Solomon Mandelkern, Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae (Tel Aviv: Schocken Publishing House Ltd., 1967).

²B. Davidson, The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Limited, 1966).

frenzy. The situations in which such forms are used are confrontations between man and his gods or among the gods themselves. The setting may be ritual or preparation for ritual, or it may be battle for life. In any event, there is a great deal at stake, and the narrator cannot be impartial.

But infix-t forms have many other nuances. They may be reflexive, separative, reciprocal, etc. Not all emotionally intense passages contain such forms. The originator or a later narrator may have added or deleted such forms from his story to suit his own ideas and feelings. Therefore, the uses of infix-t forms are not consistent, and the context does not always indicate that such a form exists.

We can, however, with some degree of confidence, apply what has been learned from the Ugaritic texts to Biblical Hebrew. Necessary and due caution must be employed, of course, but the close relationship between Hebrew and Ugaritic is well known. The case is strengthened by the example of intense infix-t found, in admittedly small numbers, in the closely-related texts of Moabite¹ and Phoenician origin. Amorite, although more remote, does not detract from the evidence, nor do the even more remote Akkadian and Arabic.

This study will proceed on the basis of the conclusion that the

¹Stanislav Segert, in "Die Sprache der moabitischen Königsinschrift," *ArOr*, 29 (1961), 250-258, maintains that the Mesha inscription was written by an Israelite (Northern Kingdom) prisoner of the King of Moab. He notes numerous similarities between the Northern writings of the Bible (e.g., the Book of Hosea, the Elijah-Elisha narratives, the "Elohistic" Psalms, 43-83) and concludes that the Moabite stone reflects only the Northern dialect of Biblical Hebrew. If Segert should be proved correct, we would have conclusive proof of infix-t forms in at least this strata of Biblical Hebrew.

Canaanite languages, including Biblical Hebrew, used infix-t forms to indicate intensification of the verbal action by the means just listed, and the deep involvement of the agent or narrator in that action. The presence of a possible infix-t form in such a passage provides some evidence that that form may actually be infix-t rather than some other possible construction.

2. If infix-t constructions existed in Biblical Hebrew, we might expect to find them among the older strata of the Old Testament, or in traditional material recorded in more recent times. In Phoenician infix-t is found in the earliest inscriptions but not in later ones, and it is possible that we could have a parallel case in Biblical Hebrew. Similarly, we might also expect to find infix-t forms retained in poetry to a greater extent than in prose. The resistance to change among poetic forms, due in part to its rhythm and meter, is well known. This is enhanced in Biblical Hebrew, and in other Semitic languages as well, by a strong tendency toward parallel construction and phrasing.¹

Such criteria cannot be conclusive evidence of an infix-t construction, of course. The case for a possible infix-t form, nevertheless, maybe strengthened if it can be shown to be imbedded in archaic material.

A search of the older strata of the Old Testament does not reveal obvious infix-t forms. The scribes have managed to eliminate them almost completely, even from such ancient material, such as the Song of

¹See Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament*, transl. by P. R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 57-64, and the bibliography on p. 54.

Deborah (Jud. 5:1-31), where we should expect to find them if they are to be found at all.

3. It is not unreasonable to expect that verbs which appear in infix-t forms in languages closely related to Hebrew might also appear in such forms in Biblical Hebrew. In other words, if we are to look for infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew, we might begin by listing all the verbs which appear in Gt, Nt, Št, etc., in Ugaritic, Phoenician, Moabite, and Amorite, and then study the forms of these verbs in the Hebrew Old Testament to see whether hidden infix-t forms can be found. Such a case would be s'l which appears in a Gt Canaanism in the Tell el-Amarna letter 280:25, in Akkadian, possibly also in Ugaritic (1021:15), and is found in the place name לִּמְשָׁל in the Hebrew Bible. Similarly the root šyn appears in Gt formations in Ugaritic and Hebrew, and šm^c takes infix-t in these languages also. A search, however, for Hebrew infix-t forms in verbs which appear in the Gt in Ugaritic, Amorite, Phoenician and Moabite is fruitless, except for the examples just mentioned, and for a few hitpa^cel forms which will be discussed later.

While the lines of study just mentioned yield no positive results by themselves, there are other lines which are more fruitful. Each of the following is discussed below: (1) There are cases where infix-t forms are "hidden" in words which appear to be derived from initial or middle t roots. In reality the root is a "weak" one and the t is an infix form, appearing in the initial or middle position. (2) Some hitpa^cel constructions of initial sibilant roots have been regarded as prefix-t forms in which metathesis has occurred. Actually, in these cases the construction is infixed-t. The t has not been metathesized but stands in its

correct position. (3) The pi^cel forms of some פ"ע verbs may contain infixed-t's. (4) In some roots the t of an infixed-t construction may be "concealed" by the process of assimilation.

1. It is quite possible that infix-t forms in Biblical Hebrew may remain hidden among certain weak verbs where a t takes the place of a "weak" radical. Examples of this may be sought among verbs whose initial radicals are ך, ך', ך, or ך. Infix-t forms of these verbs would appear as initial "t": תלד > ו תלד; חפל > נחפל, etc. Likewise, middle ך/ך ("hollow") verbs would appear as פ"ע verbs: קחם > קחרם, etc. If such infix-t forms had been regarded by later scribes and grammarians as genuine verbal roots, the forms would have remained intact. In many cases, this is indeed, what has happened.

There is concrete evidence to show that stem prefixes have become attached to verbal roots in Semitic languages. In Akkadian there is a class of quadriradical verbs whose initial consonant is š and who form only infix-t stems.¹ "N" has become attached to certain verbs in Akkadian and Ethiopic, and Arabic forms some roots with infixed-n.²

Noun and adjective forms also show this tendency. Several languages, including Hebrew, form nominal and adjectival patterns by prefixing ך, y, m, t, š (and in Akkadian and possibly Ugaritic n).³ In Akkadian, patterns with infix-t are found which give intensive force to the word, e.g., gitmalu = "very complete," itbaru = "very friendly."⁴ Semitic grammarians appear to be moving more and more to the conclusion

¹ICGSL, 130. ²Ibid., 130-131.

³Ibid., 80-82. ⁴Ibid., 82.

that verb forms arose originally from nominal forms. If this be true, we have here additional evidence for the theory of the intensifying infix-t.

The forms discussed in the preceding paragraph indicated that some triradical words have been extended to quadriradicals by means of prefixes and infixes.¹ It is also quite possible that triradical roots have been formed from biradical roots by the addition of prefixes, infixes and suffixes. It must be taken as fairly certain that many Proto-Semitic roots were biconsonantal. Many such words exist in extant material from all the Semitic languages: dm = "blood," ym = "sea," yd = "hand," dd = "uncle," hg = "festival," etc. Many verb forms which the lexicons show as triradical, e.g., initial, medial, and final w/y verbs, the so-called double-ayin verbs, actually evidence many biradical forms and characteristics: qm = "he rises," bn = "he understands," sb = "he goes around." To this evidence is added the well-known fact that many Semitic verbs which have two radicals in common have very similar or identical meanings. Moscati cites the Hebrew examples of prd = "to separate," prw = "to tear," prs = "to split," prš = "to break down," prq = "to pull apart," prr = "to dissolve," prš = "to distinguish."² This leads to the speculation that original biconsonantal roots have somewhere "picked up" a third radical along the line of their development. The significance of the added radical, however, seems generally

¹Extension occurs also by the addition of suffixes. See ICGSL, 82-83. Radicals may also be geminated or reduplicated, singly or in pairs, Ibid., 78-79. See also G. R. Driver, Problems, pp. 3-8.

²ICGSL, 73.

impossible to ascertain. It has been noted that the added radical may occasionally be initial $\dot{s}$ which comes from the causative $\dot{S}$ stem and which gives causative meaning to the word.¹ Examples of this phenomenon may be seen in Biblical Hebrew in words such as שָׁחַ = "to bow down" (שָׁחַ, Is. 51:23; שָׁחַנָה, Prov. 12:25) from an original root שָׁחַ (חִי?) which was discussed above; similarly שָׁחַ = "to bow"; perhaps, שָׁכַן = "to reside, dwell" from a root kn, יָכַן = "to be established"; and also perhaps, שָׁפַל = "to be low, abased" from a root pl, נָפַל = "to fall."

In the case of שָׁחַ and שָׁחַ the addition of $\dot{w}$ as the initial root letter appears to be a development peculiar to Biblical Hebrew, for these roots are not attested elsewhere except as a probable Canaanite gloss in the Tell el Amarna tablets.² This development may, however, have occurred in Proto-Canaanite, although it is not attested in the other Canaanite languages. The question is, of course, raised whether this is truly a secondary root or whether the Hebrews knowingly used a $\dot{s}ap^{il}$ form. The root skn is attested in several languages, including Akkadian, Arabic and the Canaanite tongues, so the development of kn > $\dot{s}kn$ must be Proto-Semitic. If the root pl existed in Proto-Semitic, as is suggested by the occurrence of $\dot{s}pl$ and npl which have almost identical meanings, it would show a two-fold development. $\dot{s}pl$ occurs in Akkadian, Arabic, Ugaritic and Hebrew; npl only in Aramaic, Hebrew and Ugaritic. We would suggest that the original root pl added an initial $\dot{s}$ in Proto-Semitic as a result of the causative element, $\dot{s}$. $\dot{s}pl$ became the dominant root in Ak-

¹ Ibid., 74.

² Knudtzon, Die El Amarna Tafeln, p. 1508.

kadian, but pl, as well as špl, continued in use in some dialects, including Proto-Northwest Semitic. In this last dialect, pl added "n" from the N stem so that the Northwest Semitic languages then evidenced špl and npl, pl having been lost in the context of an overwhelming number of triradical roots.¹

The possibility of parallel development in two or more languages should also be considered. It is quite conceivable that the addition of a third radical to a biradical root by means of a stem-forming element (š, n, t, doubled radicals, etc.) could take place in related languages simultaneously or at different periods in time.

Our point here is that just as Semitic languages have added stem-forming prefixes to their biradical roots in a movement to harmonize them with the preponderant number of triradical roots, so too have they added infix-t elements. This t appears as the middle consonant of a word in most cases, but occasionally it appears as the initial consonant in words whose initial letter is weak, i.e., w/y, h or n. Before the new element became rigidly fixed to the root, however, there was a time when it was a viable element in that language. It was used by the speakers of the tongue quite consciously as a stem-forming element, probably for a considerable length of time before its stem-forming characteristics were lost. It would have retained, in most cases, the force which was given to it by the infixed (or prefixed) element, although even this could have been lost with the passage of time as language changed and words took on different nuances of meaning.

¹Note also the Epigraphic South Arabian word plt (plural?) = "trench, excavation."

It has been pointed out that Biblical Hebrew does not outwardly reflect the conscious use of infix-t constructions. There are, however, a number of roots with initial or medial ׀ which have been taken as original or secondary roots by scribes and grammarians who have not recognized their original character. Three of these roots have already been touched upon; they will be discussed first in greater detail, then others will be added to the list.

a) The first of the middle ׀ words we have considered above is the Hebrew word ׀ׁׁׁ from the root syn. Its infix-t character had been noted by Brockelmann, Cross, Freedman, Dahood and others. The fact that the original root ׀ׁׁ appears in Biblical Hebrew (2 K. 18:27 = Is. 36:12), alongside the infix-t form (1 Sam. 25:22, 34; 1 K. 14:10; 16:11; 21:21; 2 K. 9:8), indicates that the latter may have been consciously used by those who spoke the words. This cannot be known for certain, however, since the infix-t form always appears in the expression ׀ׁׁׁׁׁׁׁ as a somewhat derogatory designation of men, and it is always spoken as a threat. Still the use of the infix-t here is quite in keeping with the intense nature of the form. It appears first among ancient material (the so-called "Early Source" of Samuel) and was, in our opinion, used by men who were familiar with the infix-t construction.

b) The second example discussed briefly above is the use of ׀ׁׁׁׁ in the expression ׀ׁׁׁׁׁׁ, which has been noted several times by Fr. Dahood. As we have seen, the LXX translates ׀ׁׁׁׁ as though two separate verbs were involved, sometimes from the root ׀ׁׁׁ - "to hide"; sometimes from ׀ׁׁׁ - "to turn away." The Vulgate supports this to some extent, although it is not consistent in its translations.

There can be no question that the two roots סח and סח exist in Biblical Hebrew. סח appears in the qal many times where the meaning must be "to turn aside, away" (Ex. 3:3, 4; 8:7, 25, etc.), and סח appears in passages where the meaning can be only "to hide" (1 Sam. 20:5, 19, 24; Jer. 23:24; 36:19, etc.). The latter root is also attested with the same meaning in Arabic. In the passages where we find the expression $\text{סח} \text{פניו}$, the root which has generally been taken as סח is better translated as a form of סח , and the explanation of the form is then not hip'il of סח but hipt'al of סח . The large majority of these passages have to do with man's unfaithfulness to God, and express the threat that God will turn his face away in anger (Dt. 31:17, 18; 32:20; Is. 8:17, etc.), thus the intensive force of the infix-t. While some of the non-hip'il occurrences of סח might be translated by "turn away" as well as "hide," only Ps. 89:47 is translated by $\alpha\nu\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\omega$ in the LXX and by averto in the Vulgate. The form in this passage is pointed as a nip'al סח , but if we consider it an infix-t form, it would be either Gt or Nt, depending on whether or not we consider the ס doubled.

The fact that the LXX distinguishes carefully between the hip'il סח and the infix-t סח lends heavy weight to the theory of Fr. Dahood. It cannot be said that the form is used with a great deal of variety or imagination, and it is possible that the phrase $\text{סח} \text{פניו}$ became traditional in its use without real consideration for its true form. The fact, however, that it occurs frequently in early material and conforms to the intensifying nature of infix-t causes the weight of evidence to fall on the side of acceptance of it as an infix-t construction.

c) The third root which has already been touched upon is cr for which

Albright, as we have seen proposes a meaning "to help" which he draws from the Hebrew ʿtr = "to pray (for help)," and cognates in Akkadian, including the Tell el-Amarna tablets.¹ He thus disagrees with those who translate ʿrr with the meaning "to arouse, awake."²

It is unnecessary to give a new meaning to רר, for the basic meaning of "to arouse, to awake" is sufficient to account for both the occurrences of this verb and the verb רר in Biblical Hebrew. רר is an infix-t form of רר (or רר as some Hebrew lexicons list it³) and has the intensive meaning of "to arouse (deity) by entreaty, by prayer, to pray," just as the infix-t form of רר appears in the Arabic VIII conjugation (ʿiʿtarra) with the same meaning.

The various forms of רר occur in the MT only in connection with deity; either the entreaty is directed toward God or God acts as a result of entreaty. The situations are always urgent ones; the outcome is of grave importance to man. The verb is usually found in older strata of the Old Testament, appearing in J, Judges, Job, Samuel, Isaiah, but it is also used later in Ezra-Chronicles.

Thus, the root רר is represented in the MT as follows:

G: רר: awaken, arouse (thymself).

N: רר: he is aroused.

Š: רר: he causes to be aroused.

¹W. F. Albright, "North Canaanite Poems," 122, note 105. See page 106 above.

²UT, 461; UL, 32; WUS, 241.

³BDE and Köhler-Baumgartner, for instance,

⁴We do not list the possible pilpel form ררר (Is. 15:5) which is in our opinion probably a scribal error.

tD: הַתְעוּרָרִי : rouse yourself.¹

Gt: יָעַחַר : he arouses (God), and

הַעֲחִירָא : he arouses (God).

Nt: יָעַחַר : he (God) is aroused.

In the unpointed text, all the forms of עָחַר would appear the same, and only the vocalization would indicate the actual stem. Later scribes, noting the prefixed ה of some Gt forms, assumed its causative (hip'il) nature and pointed it accordingly. It is undoubtedly true that later scribes regarded עָחַר as a separate root and treated עָחַר and עָרַר quite differently. It should be recognized that a root 'tr with the same meaning does not exist in the other Semitic languages, and so it would appear that this verb arose only from the use of infix-t in stem formation of the verb עָרַר.

The cases just discussed are not the only examples of this phenomenon. Several other examples follow:

d) חוּל (חִיל) and חָחַל : The common Semitic root hwl has the meaning of "to whirl, writhe," as in dancing or in the pain of childbirth. It appears in Ugaritic (75:I:25) in the sense of "to go into labor, bear," and in Hebrew often with the same meaning (cf. Is. 51:2; Job 39:1). Related to the verb are the nominal forms חוּל = "sand" (which whirls and twists in the wind), and חִיל = "writhe, anguish."

The verb forms חָחַל and חָחַל occur in Ezek. 16:4: וְהִמַּח לָא
חָחַל וְהִמַּח לָא חָחַל "You were not rubbed with salt nor swathed with

¹It must be noted that the hitpa'el (tD) occurs in the late passages Is. 51:17; 64:6, and in Job 17:8; 31:9, which is of doubtful date.

²UT, 401.

bands." The root חול is not attested in other Semitic languages,¹ and its forms must be infix-t in this passage, intensified by the use of the infinitive absolute, but intensified also by the use of the infix-t which indicates here the action of swaddling an infant by wrapping cloth around and around its body.

The nouns חוללה = "swaddling band" (Job 38:9) and חחול = "bandage," (Ezek. 30:21) are related to חול in the same way as the verb forms. The process may be reconstructed from nominal form to verb. The nouns were given the infix-t to indicate the repetitive motion of "swaddling" an infant or "bandaging" an injury. From the nominal form, the verb form, "to swaddle, wrap around and around," could have arisen.

e) חורח and חורח: In several places in the Old Testament (Num. 32:41; Dt. 3:14; Jos. 13:30; Jud. 10:4; 1 K. 4:13; 1 Chr. 2:23), the plural word חורח, חורחיהם appears. It is derived from a root hwy, attested in Arabic, which means "to collect, gather" and is used to designate a circle (collection, gathering) of tents. The Hebrew word has the meaning of "tent-village."

In three² passages we find a verb which appears to have the root חחח, but whose meaning is much the same as that given above for חחח: Is. 30:14: לחחח אש מיקוד "to gather up fire from the hearth."

¹Gordon (UT, 399) and Aistleitner (WUS, 109) list htl = "a wrapper, swaddle" but the context in which the word appears (75:1:19) does not explain its meaning and both scholars derive their conclusion from the Hebrew word חוללה.

²BDB, 367, includes חחח, Ps. 52:7, in the list of occurrences, but we agree with Köhler-Baumgartner that this is from a different root, Akkadian hatu = "to destroy."

Prov. 6:27: **הִיחָתָה אִישׁ אֵשׁ בְּחִיקוֹ** : "Can a man gather fire to his bosom . . . ?"

Prov. 25:22: **כִּי גַחְלִים אַתָּה חָתָה עַל רֹאשׁוֹ** : "for you will gather fire upon his head."

In each case the gathering is the gathering of fire, quite different from and entailing much more intensity than the gathering of a circle of tents. One thinks of the concentration needed to gather up hot coals, and the violent movements required. Köhler-Baumgartner translates the word "to rake" together the hot coals, indicating the repetitive action of raking. The forms then are Gt of the root hwy = "to gather."

f) **חַר** and **חָתַר** : In Biblical Hebrew is found the word **חָתַר** , (1 Sam. 14:11; 2 K. 2:10; Ezek. 8:7; Song Sol. 5:4; Job 30:6; Nah. 2:13; Zech. 14:12) which designates a "hole." It stems from a root hrr attested in Akkadian hararu = "to bore, pierce"; as a noun, hurru = "hole, ravine"; and in Arabic **حَرٌّ** = "hole."¹

A verb form **חָתַר** occurs in Ezekiel, Amos, Job, and Jonah with the meaning "to dig, to row (a boat)." The passages are:

Ezek. 8:8: **חָתַר נָא בְּקִיר וְאַחֲתַר בְּקִיר** : "Dig, I pray you, into the wall, and I dug into the wall."

Ezek. 12:5: **חָתַר לְךָ בְּקִיר** : "Dig by yourself into the wall."

Ezek. 12:7: **חָתַרְתִּי לִי בְּקִיר כִּיד** : "I dug by myself into the wall with (my) hands."

Ezek. 12:12: **יִחָתְרוּ בְּקִיר** : "They shall dig into the wall."

¹A word hr occurs in Ugaritic (5:1, 5; 6:17 and possibly elsewhere, see UT, 404), but its translation is not clear from the context.

Amos 9:2: כְּשֹׂאֵל יִחְדְּרוּ: "If they dig into Sheol."

Job 24:16: כְּחֹשֶׁךְ בְּתֵימִים: "They dig (into) houses in the dark."

Jonah 1:13: וַיִּחְדְּרוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים: "The men rowed (the ship)."

The root חדר is attested only in late Aramaic. The intensive repetitive character of digging and rowing indicates that instead of a root חדר we have infix-t forms of חרר. From the verbal form has arisen the verbal noun, מַחְדָּרָה = "a breaking (digging) in, a burglary," found in Ex. 22:1 (E).

g) כול and כחל: The Semitic root כול, meaning "to contain, measure" occurs in Akkadian, Arabic, Aramaic and Syriac, as well as Biblical Hebrew. In the latter it can have nuances of meaning such as "to sustain, support, contain, hold, hold in."¹ Thus in Is. 40:12, "Who has enclosed (כל) the dust of the earth in a measure . . . ?" In this sense there is a possible derivative in כחלנו = "our wall" in Song Sol. 2:9. Most scholars, however, derive the word from the Arabic كح = "to press together." A word כחל appears in late Aramaic.² If the root be כול = "to hold, contain" or even "to measure," then כחל is that which contains or measures, i.e., a wall. It portrays possibly the durative force of the infix "t."

h) כור and כתר: The Semitic root כור means "to be round." It is attested in Arabic with the idea of "winding" a turban or "to turn" or "twist." From this "round" are derived several nominal forms designating round objects: כר (Gen. 31:34) = "camel saddle (basket)"; כור

¹ BDB, 465; Köhler-Baumgartner, 426.

² Jastrow, I, 627.

(Dt. 4:20; Jer. 11:4; 1 K. 8:41, etc., attested also in Aramaic, Ethiopic, Akkadian) = "furnace, smelting pot"; כִּיר (Lev. 11:35) = "cooking pot"; כִּיר, כִּיור (Ex. 30:18, 28; 31:9; 35:16; 38:8; 39:39, etc.) = "pot, laver."

In several instances in the Old Testament there are found forms of כָּחַר whose meaning is usually taken as "to surround." Examples follow:

Jud. 20:43: כָּחַר: "Surrounding the Benjaminites, they . . ."

Ps. 22:13: כָּחַרְנִי: "Many bulls encompass me."

Ps. 142:8: יְכָחֵר: "The righteous will surround me."

Prov. 14:18: יְכָחֵר: "The prudent are crowned (surrounded) with knowledge."

Hab. 1:4: מִכָּחִיר: "The wicked surround the righteous."¹

The force of the infix-t is durative. The object is surrounded without recourse; he is fixed in his position, be it for good or evil. The infixed element changes the meaning thus from "be round" to "go around, surround."

Nominal forms are attested in כָּחַרְתָּ and כָּחַרְתָּ (1 K. 7:16; Jer. 52:22; 2 Chr. 4:12, 13, etc.) to designate the capital of a pillar. The infix-t portrays the permanent roundness, perhaps also the repetitive decorations (pomegranates, etc.) of the pillar. The roundness of כִּוֵּר is thus quite clearly shown in the noun. The capital does not "surround" anything.

Another nominal form, כָּחַר, also occurs, but only in the Book of

¹ Job 36:2, לִי כָחַר, has been purposely omitted from this list. We would derive the meaning from the Aramaic כָּחַר which means "to join closely" and would translate, "Join me closely, and I will show you."

Esther (1:11; 2:17; 6:8). It means "crown" and is of late origin. The same word occurs in late Talmudic material and may be due to Hebrew influence.

i) נָכַח and נָחַח: The root נָכַח, attested in Akkadian, Arabic and Aramaic has the idea of "to hollow out" or designates something that is hollowed out, i.e., a "flute" or "reed." In Biblical Hebrew it appears in Ex. 27:8; 38:7; Job 11:12; Jer. 52:21 as a verb meaning "to hollow something out," or "to be hollow," i.e., pillars, an altar; even a man's head is called "hollow" to indicate his stupidity (Job 11:12).

A frequent word in the Hebrew Old Testament is נַחֲיִכָּה (Job 18:10; 28:7; 41:24; Ps. 78:50; 119:35; Prov. 12:28), נַחֲיִכָּה (Is. 43:16; Job 30:13; 38:20, etc.) which means "path" or "pathway." The usual root of the word is taken to be the Arabic *ntb* which means "to swell forth, become protuberant," but this can hardly be the root of a word for a path which is beaten down by those who traverse it. A pathway becomes "hollowed out" by the repeated action of foot and wheel. Thus the far more reasonable solution is to derive the word from נָכַח. Intensive, repetitive force is indicated by the infix-t.

j) פָּלַל and פָּחַל: A root פָּלַל is attested in Aramaic¹ with the meaning "to argue, debate." The Biblical Hebrew lexicons list a root פָּחַל = "to twist," related to the same roots in Arabic, Ethiopic, Aramaic and Syriac. In most of the passages where this root occurs, the meaning of "twist" or "crooked" is quite pertinent. The nominal form = "thread, cord" is equally justified, but in Gen. 30:8 the meaning "twist" is not as well

¹Jastrow, II, 1183.

justified. The verse is as follows:

ותאמר רחל נפתולי אלהים נפתלתי עם אחתי גם
יכלתי וחקרא שמו נפתלי

The RSV translation is, "Then Rachel said, 'With mighty wrestlings I have wrestled with my sister, and have prevailed'; so she called his name Naphtali." The word "wrestled" is used figuratively to indicate the intertwisting of the bodies of the Rachel and her sister, Leah. If, however, the root be פלל, the sense of the passage is much abetted, and the dignity of the Hebrew women is maintained: "'With mighty arguments I have argued with my sister, and have prevailed'; so she called his name Naphtali." The intensity of the infix-t is clearly indicated; the violent, repetitive action of two women in heated argument is indicated in the "t" form of the verb פלל and is perpetuated in the name of a son.

רָחַח and רָחַח־תּ is a much used word in the Old Testament to express the meaning "breath, wind, spirit." It never appears in verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew, but verbal forms are known in Arabic, Ethiopic and Syriac, and its nominal forms are known in most of the Semitic languages. רָחַח is found in verb forms in Ezekiel (24:5) and Job (30:27; 41:23) with the meaning of "to boil, to cause to boil." A nominal form is also found in Ezek. 24:5. The passages are as follows:

Ezek. 24:5: רָחַח רָחֻחֶיהָ: "Boil its boilings."

Job 30:27: מַעֵי רָחֹחַ: "My insides boiled."

Job 41:23: יָרָחִיחַ כַּסִּיר מְצֻלָּה: "He made the pot boil like the deep."

The action is one of violent, repetitive, directionless action, and thus the infix-t is required. The unpointed forms would be clearly

infix-t forms of the verb $\text{תָּנַח$. The Massoretes have pointed the text according to their own understanding of Hebrew stems in relationship to the context.

A root תָּנַח is attested in Aramaic, in various versions of the Talmud.¹ The passages are all late, however, and it is probable that the Talmudic author took the word from the Hebrew Bible without recognizing its true character.

1) תָּנַח and $\text{תָּנַח$. In several Semitic languages besides Biblical Hebrew, the root תָּנַח means "to bend, curve." In Biblical Hebrew, the word תָּנַח signifies a "wing" or "shoulder" of a bird or a man (Jud. 16:8; 1 Sam. 17:6, etc.). The infix-t indicates the repetitive bending motion of the wing or the shoulder as the arm moves. A root kt is attested in Arabic, so it is apparently not a peculiarly Hebrew word. Perhaps the "infixing" was permanently accomplished in Proto-Semitic, and the root has thus become a secondary one in the later language.

m) Another possibility is the relationship of תָּנַח - "to heap up, accumulate" and the word of the Psalms $\text{תָּנַח$ (Ps. 16:1; 56:1; 57:1; 58:1; 59:1; 60:1). Much has been written on the etymology and meaning of this word,² and to these possibilities we would add the possibility of the infix-t. The Psalms so designated would be the "accumulated" poetry of David. The intensity is in the devotion they express.

Besides the middle-"t" words just discussed, there is the pos-

¹Jastrow, II, 1502.

²The latest work of which I am aware is that of Fr. Dahood, Psalms, II, p. 41. (cf. also Psalms, I, p. 87), who derives the word from kātam - "to inscribe" which appears also in Jer. 2:22.

sibility that initial w/y and n roots would add a t as the initial root letter: ytxx > txx; ntxx > txx. A check of the lexicons, however, turns up few possibilities. We would mention the following:

a) אכ and אח: A root y^b is attested in Syriac and once in Biblical Hebrew (Ps. 119:131) meaning "to long for, desire." It is probably related to the root bh which is found in Akkadian (abitu = "desire"), Ethiopic and Biblical Hebrew, and Arabic, which means "to be willing, consent." In Ps. 119:40, 174, we find the verb form אֶחְאַכֶּה, "I long for," perhaps the infix-t form of אֶחְאַכֶּה. The nominal form אֶחְאַכֶּה is found in Ps. 119:20. Forms of אח are also found in Talmudic and Mid-rashic literature.¹ The infix-t can here be an intensifying element. It indicates more than consent or willingness, rather, ardent desire.

b) נח and נח: The Arabic root nwh means "to be high, eminent." The same root appears to be evident in the difficult verse, Ezek. 7:11: "neither shall there be pre-eminence among them." The word appears to be related to נח (Ezek. 9:4, 6) and נח (Job 31:35), indicating a "mark" on the forehead or upon a writing tablet. The denominative verb appears in 1 Sam. 21:14, נָחַת (Ketib—נָחַת Qere), meaning, "he made marks upon the doors of the gate," and in Ezek. 9:4: נָחַת, "set a mark upon the foreheads of the men." Thus, a mark is that which is permanently eminent; the infix-t is durative.

c) There is a similar connection between נח which can mean "to sprinkle" (Prov. 7:17) and נח = "to spit" (Job 17:6), "I am one before whom men spit."

¹Jastrow, 1641.

The root ׀׀׀ usually has the meaning of "to wave," but if this analysis is correct, the infix-t would indicate the intensity of spitting in the face of one he detests.

2. Unrecognized infix-t forms may also be concealed within the hitpa^cel stem of certain Hebrew verbs with sibilants as their initial root letter. Most of the Semitic languages transpose t before a sibilant: ts > st; tš > št; ts' > š't; tš' > š't, and Biblical Hebrew is no exception. Accordingly, Hebrew verbs with sibilants in initial position appear in the hitpa^cel to be infix-t forms; i.e., the "t" is thus placed immediately after the first consonant of the root. It is quite conceivable that some of these forms were originally intended to be infix-t, and when scribes began to write only prefix-t forms, these were left unchanged for reasons of euphony.

Examples of this have already been mentioned, i.e., the place names ׀׀׀׀׀ and ׀׀׀׀׀. At first glance these look like standard hitpa^cel constructions with metathesis of the ׀ and ׀, but when it is realized that the ׀ is prosthetic and the second root letter remains undoubled, the conclusion is evident that the forms are intentionally infix-t.

The following hitpa^cel forms have meanings other than the reflexive force usually ascribed to that verbal stem. We would see in these original infix-t forms of ׀" sibilant verbs:

a) ׀׀׀׀׀ (Gen. 24:21): "The man gazed at her in silence." The root ׀׀׀ = "to gaze at" does not appear elsewhere in the Old Testament, but the sense of the passage is durative or intensive. The man "gazes at her" intently to learn "whether the Lord had prospered his journey or not."

b) שִׁכַּחוּ (Eccl. 8:10): "They were forgotten in the city where they had done such things." The verb שִׁכַּח means "to forget," and it does not seem to make sense in this context. Kittel suggests emendation to וְשִׁבַּחוּ, "and they were praised in the city where they had done such things," and he is followed in this by the RSV. Regardless of which verb was intended, the action is intensified by virtue of repetition or duration of that action. One might add "continually" or "repeatedly" to qualify the verb, "praise."

c) תִּשְׁכַּרְיָם (1 Sam. 1:14): 'And Eli said to her, "How long will you be drunken?"' Eli implies here that Hannah is a habitual drunkard, or that she has been in a drunken stupor for a long time. The verb שָׁכַר is thus intensified by durative, iterative or even habitative force, cf. Akkadian -tan- stems. This is quite in keeping with the use of infix-t stems as outlined above.

d) רָאשָׁמַר (Ps. 18:24): "I kept myself from guilt." The root שָׁמַר = "to keep" is given durative and reflexive force by its infix-t construction. The speaker has not remained guiltless for a few moments, but his innocence has occurred over a long period of time.

e) הִסְתַּרְפֵּי (Ps. 84:11): "I would rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my Lord." The verb הִסְתַּר = "to guard" is intensified by the infix-t construction. The speaker is talking in terms of a permanent state of affairs, not a transient one.

E. A. Speiser has shown that the hitpa^cel in Biblical Hebrew combines several kinds of t-stems, both prefix and infix.¹ Some of

¹E. A. Speiser, "The Durative Hithpa^cel: A Tan Form" Oriental and Biblical Studies, ed. by J. J. Finkelstein and Moshe Greenberg

the hitpa^cel forms express repeated or continuous action, which Speiser includes under the term "habitative function."¹ He derives this function from the Akkadian iterative habitative -tan- form, the "n" having disappeared by assimilation to the following consonant. Using the verb hlk as his main example, the author demonstrates how the Akkadian -tan- form and the Hebrew hitpa^cel can have the same meanings, e.g., "to walk about, to wander (aimlessly), to proceed, to follow, to walk before, in the presence of, to walk with, commune."² Speiser reconstructs the step-by-step change from infix-tan to prefix-hit as follows:

"ga-tan-tala > gatattala > igtattala > hitgattel (the last step under the influence of the Hithpa^cel proper)."³

Apparently unaware of Speiser's earlier work, Dombrowski arrives at similar conclusions.⁴ Emphasizing heavily the durative and iterative character of the infix-t forms, particularly in Arabic, he arrives at the conclusion that the Hebrew hitpa^cel may also express durative force. He, too, mentions hlk as an example.

Speiser's examples are bl = "to mourn"; np = "to grow/be angry"; šs = "to shake"; nhl = "to inherit"; tp = "to grow/be weak, faint"; šy/šy = "to gaze"; wy = "to desire."⁵ Dombrowski also lists bl, adds

(Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1967), pp. 506-514. The article first appeared in JAOS, 75 (1955), 118-121.

¹Ibid., 508.

²Ibid., 510-511.

³Ibid., 514.

⁴Dombrowski, "Some Remarks on the Hebrew Hithpa^cel," 220-223.

⁵Speiser, "The Durative Hithpa^cel," 508.

tmm = "to act justly," and includes ndb = "to devote, dedicate" from the "Dead Sea Manual of Discipline (IQS) V, lff."¹

To this evidence we would note that hlk also appears in Ugaritic with some of the same meanings as those listed by Speiser. To list of examples we would add the following, all of which are attested in the Gt in Ugaritic:

- a) כהתאסף (Dt. 33:5): "When the heads of the people were gathered." The gathering is a permanent one and "thus the Lord became king in Jeshurun."
- b) ונשאו (Num. 24:7): "And his kingdom shall be exalted." The sense is one of permanency. Israel shall be lifted up forever.
- c) יתאמרו (Ps. 94:4): "They (the wicked) boast, all the evildoers." The boasting is continual, repeated. The verb parallels יתכרך which could also be hitpa^cel, except for the pointing.
- d) ואני פלתי (Dt. 9:18): "And I lay prostrate before the Lord these forty days and forty nights." (See also Dt. 9:25.)

There is one verbal form which has long been regarded by many grammarians as a hitpa^cel form, but which is now shown to be otherwise. The form is השתחוה which Gesenius regarded as the hitpa^cel of the root שחח.² He is followed in this interpretation by Bauer and Leander.³ Even the comparatively recent grammar by Paul Joüon comments thus:

Verbe שחח: forme hitpa^clel השתחוה se courber, se posterner, adorer. La racine est privativement שחח, donc . . . La conjugation est hitpa^clel . . . avec repetition de la 3^e radi-

¹Dombrowski, "Some Remarks," 222.

²GHC, 215.

³HGHS, 426.

cale. La forme exprime l'action intensive réfléchie se courber,¹
se posterner.

Cross and Freedman noted some years ago that השחח was a hištagtal form, closely related to the infix-t conjugations.² In actuality the form is Št from the root חחח as noted by Cyrus Gordon.³ In Ugaritic we find the same form tšthwy (49:I:10; 51:IV:26; VII:28; 137:15, 31; 2 Aq:VI:50; 'nt:III:7; VI:19, 20), and yšthwy (129:6; 'nt pl. ix:III:25; yšthwyn 'nt pl. ix:II:16). The preformative "h" in Hebrew probably arose by way of analogy to the hip'il, hitpa'el, etc. The Š is the sign of the causative stem used in Akkadian, Ugaritic, Arabic, Amorite, Ethiopic and occasionally in Biblical Aramaic.⁴ The usual causative element in Aramaic is "t" and in Biblical Hebrew it is "h." The Š causative is probably represented in the MT by a few forms:

שלהכח = "flame"; שכלול = "snail" and שקערורח = "depressions."⁵ The "t" element is placed after the Š and generally indicates reflexive or passive force. Moscatti states that the "t" element is a prefix and is transposed with Š under the principles of metathesis as operative in the Semitic languages. This may be seriously questioned, however, since the Št conjugation is well attested in Akkadian (uštaqbar = passive of the causative; uštaqalbar = causative-reflexive, etc.⁶), where prefix-t

¹Jouön, Grammaire, p. 164.

²Cross and Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," 201.

³UT, 83.

⁴See the survey of causative stems in ICGSL, 125-127.

⁵GHC, 153.

⁶GAG, 122-123.

elements (except for pronominal prefixes) are otherwise unknown.

In the Biblical Hebrew word **השתחוה** we have a meaning which is both reflexive and causative, "he caused himself to fall down, he prostrated himself, he worshipped." The word appears in both older and more recent strata of the MT, for it is attested as early as The Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49:8) and as late as Esther (3:2, 5). The word is used with great flexibility, for while it most often designates humility before God, it may also indicate humility before "other gods" and even before men (Joseph's brothers before him, Gen. 43:26, 28). It appears in several persons in both the prefix and suffix conjugations, in the imperative mood, in participial and infinitive forms. It is occasionally found in the rather stereotyped phrases **וישחך וישתחו** and **וישחך ארצה**; it is usually employed spontaneously to the situation at hand. Thus, while the construction **St** is unusual for Biblical Hebrew as represented in the MT, the form was obviously a viable one for the writers of the Old Testament.

3. In this study, consideration has been given D stem forms of **ע"ת** verbs, i.e., **pi'el** and **pu'al** forms, where a doubled **t** in middle position might indicate that the first **t** is the infixed element and the second **t** is the second root letter. There are many such forms, and some may be given here by way of example:

a) **כָּחַר** (Gen. 15:10): The root is taken as **כחך** = "to cut in two," and the phrase in which it is found is, "And he brought him all these (sacrificial animals) and he cut them in two."

b) **וַחֲזִיזְךָ** (Job 4:14): The root is **חזח** = "to be shattered, dismayed." The passage reads, "then thou dost dismay me with dreams."

c) כָּתְבוּ (Is. 10:1): The root is כָּתַב = "to write," and the passage is, "and the writers who keep writing oppression . . ."

d) פָּתַח (Job 30:11): The root is פָּתַח = "to open," and the passage in Job reads "because God has loosed (opened) my cord . . ." Several other examples of פָּתַח in the pi'el exist.

Care has been taken in the selection of the above examples to choose only those middle t verbs which appear also in related languages. Thus the question of secondary or derivative roots is avoided for the moment.

The fact that the above verbs are in the pi'el stem is indicative of the intensive nature of the action they connote. Whether or not these verb forms were originally infix-t must remain unanswered on the basis of present knowledge. It is quite possible, however, that this was the case, and later scribes vocalized the words according to the only manner of intensification they knew, the pi'el stem. In any case, the distinction between infix-t and the pi'el of middle t verbs has been lost.

4. It is possible that infix-t constructions could be hidden in verb forms where the t has been assimilated to an adjacent consonant. As has been indicated, this happens frequently in similar forms in Akkadian and Arabic. Assimilation of t is not common, though not unknown, in Biblical Hebrew.

While assimilation of t and dentals in Akkadian and Arabic is usually progressive, i.e., $\text{st} > \text{ss}$; $\text{dt} > \text{dd}$, etc., in Hebrew, according to standard grammars, the reverse is usually the case: $\text{td} > \text{dd}$; $\text{tt} > \text{tt}$, etc. As examples, we have מִדְּכַר > מִדְּכָר; יִטְמַא > יִטְמָא.¹ With z and s however, the assimilation is progressive: הִזְכַּר > הִזְכָּר; נִצְחָק >

¹GHG, 69.

פְּרוּצַי .¹ The well-known study of Joseph H. Greenberg² has shown vividly the reluctance of the Semitic languages to place *t* with other dentals or interdental plosives or fricatives. This is quite true of Biblical Hebrew, and it is quite possible that roots containing such dentals or interdentals in first or second position would "refuse" to form infix-*t* constructions. It is a matter of fact that of all the verbs which evidence infix-*t* forms in Ugaritic, Moabite, Phoenician and Amorite, only one has such a consonant in the first position. This verb is *tmr* = "to bear fruit," and it may be noted that the interdental fricative consonant *t* becomes a palato-velar fricative in Hebrew (š). Only *ḥṣb* has a dental plosive in second position. No other Ugaritic verb which evidences an infix-*t* construction, has a dental or interdental plosive or fricative in first or second position. This does not mean, however, that verbs with such consonants did not form infix-*t* stems. They may well have, but the *t* was assimilated to an adjacent consonant and the orthography fails to indicate it.

The fact that Arabic and Akkadian assimilate *t* elements progressively while Hebrew assimilates them by regression is strange. Other phonetic principles are fairly consistent throughout the Semitic languages, and we would normally expect consistency here. It would be quite in order, in my opinion, to see progressive assimilation in Hebrew, too. Thus, for example, *ṭṭṭ* is usually taken as the regressively assimilated form of

¹HQHS, 197. The assimilation of the *t* in the last example is, of course, only partial, i.e., *ṣt > ṣṭ*. See also Jónon, *Grammaire*, 51-52.

²Joseph H. Greenberg, "The Patterning of Root Morphemes in Semitic," *Word*, 6 (1950), 162-181.

the hitpa^cel מִחַחֵר , i.e., td>dd. If, on the other hand, the form were Gt (or Dt), the assimilation would be of the more universal progressive type: מִדַּחֵר > מִחַחֵר. Biblical Hebrew would then be in accord with Arabic and Akkadian at this point.

The form מִדַּחֵר occurs in 2 Sam. 14:13; Num. 7:89; Ez. 2:2; 43:6, and all portray urgent situations. In the first, the woman of Tekoa is accusing David because he has banished Absalom; in the other passages, God is speaking in urgent tones to his spokesmen, Moses and Ezekiel, respectively. These are in keeping with the nature of infix-t passages as we know them. הִזְכֵּר (Is. 1:16) is a comparable case. It may be that the original form was הִזְחֵר, and by progressive assimilation we now have the form הִזְכֵּר. The passage in Isaiah is a command to "wash, make yourselves clean," in preparation for coming before the Lord to offer sacrifice. One recalls the passages in Ugaritic literature where rhš is used in the Gt for similar purposes.¹

הִטְחֵרֵנּוּ (Jos. 22:17) offers a similar example with the emphatic letter ṭ. The word appears in several passages, most of which are late (Ezra 6:20; Neh. 13:22; Is. 66:17), but also in some early material (Gen. 35:2; "E"). It is used chiefly by P, however, in the expression of ritual purification. It is possible that the original form was infix-t, הִטְחֵרֵנּוּ.

These examples and many others which could be listed are open to question, of course, and we cannot be definitive in analyses of their actual forms. All of them might also be hitpa^cel with regressive assimilation.²

¹In this Isaiah passage, הִזְכֵּר parallels הָחַץ.

²For further light on assimilation in the hitpa^cel stem, see David Yellin, "The Hipa^cel-Wif^cal Conjugation in Hebrew and Aramaic, and

This was certainly the understanding of the Massoretes and later Hebrew grammarians. The question must remain an open one, but the possibility of infix-t constructions in such cases cannot be ruled out.

The following table summarizes the occurrence of infix-t constructions in Biblical Hebrew and indicates the places of their appearance in the Massoretic Text.

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF INFIX-T FORMS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

	Form ¹	Root	Location
1.	שחין	שין	1 Sam.; 1, 2 Kings
2.	הסחיר	סור	Dt.; Is. and * throughout O.T.
3.	עחר	עור	J; Jud.; Job; Sam.; Is.; Ezra-Chron.
4.	חחלח	חול	Ezek.; Job
5.	חחה	חיה	Num.; Dt.; Jos.; Jud.; 1 Kings; 1 Chr.; Is; Prov.
6.	חחר	חרר	Ezek.; Amos; Job; Jonah
7.	כוחל	כול	Song Sol.
8.	כחרו	כור	Jud.; Ps.; Prov.; Hab.; 1 Kings; Jer.; 2 Chr.
9.	נחכ	נכב	Job; Prov.; Is.
10.	נפחלח	פלל	Gen.
11.	רחח	רוחח	Ezek.; Job
12.	כחף	כפף	Throughout O.T.
13.	מכחם	כום	Ps.
14.	תאכח	י'אכ	Ps.
15.	חוי	נוה	Ezek.

the Assimilation of ך in the Hitpa'el Conjugation," JPOS (1924), 85-106.

TABLE 3—Continued

	Form	Root	Location
16.	תפת	נרף	Job
17.	והם חכו	מכך	Dt.
18.	ינחשו	נשה	Jer.
19.	נשזוה	שוה	Prov.
20.	משזאה	שאה	Gen.
21.	ישזכחו	שכח	Eccl.
22.	ושזכרים	שכר	1 Sam.
23.	אשזמר	שמר	Ps.
24.	הסזורף	ספף	Ps.
25.	כהזאסף	אסף	Dt.
26.	וזחנשא	נשא	Num.
27.	יזאמר	אמר	Ps.
28.	וזאחנפל	נפל	Dt.
29.	השזחווה	חווה	Throughout O.T.
30.	ויזכר	זכר	Gen.
31.	והזחנני	חנח	Job
32.	זכזכר	זכז	Is.
33.	פזחח	פזח	Job
34.	הזפזקדו	פזקד	Jud.; Num.; 1 Kings

¹Only representative forms are given for each root.

The hidden infix-t forms discussed above occur in all chronological strata of the Hebrew Old Testament, but the large majority of them occur in the older material. They occur in all persons, both prefix and suffix conjugations, in St, Gt, Dt and Nt. They are used with great flexibility to indicate intensity, repetition, duration and other inflections of meaning common to the infix-t. The roots discussed do not occur in the initial or middle t form in other Semitic languages except perhaps late Talmudic and other Aramaic, but basically Jewish, literature. In later

times, i.e., probably around the last half of the first millennium B.C., they may have been employed as secondary roots, the knowledge or practice of infix-t conjugations having been lost.

The reason these forms have not been recognized as infix-t is because of the Massoretic system of pointing, and the earlier scribal use of matres lectionis to indicate vocalization. Had it not been for these phenomena, the true character of these words and constructions would have been seen much earlier, just as they were at once recognized in Ugari-tic. All of this is, of course, complicated by the fact that the Massoretes were unfamiliar with the infix-t, and they, like earlier scribes, changed the forms to make them conform with that which they did understand. In this manner, easily recognizable infix-t forms have been obliterated and only the well-hidden ones remain.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

On the basis of this study, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. Infix-t forms are far more frequent in the Massoretic Text than has heretofore been recognized. While no obvious forms exist, several possible forms have been proposed by others. To this we have now added more than twenty-five examples, nominal and verbal, which are now seen to be probable infix-t constructions. They have been taken up to this point as middle t or initial t primary or secondary roots. These infix-t forms occur in all persons, and most conjugations.
2. The meanings of the infix-t in Biblical Hebrew, as in Ugaritic, and probably also in the other Semitic languages, is basically intensifying. The intensification is indicated by strong emotion, by a profound sense of urgency, by repetition of the action even to the point of frenzy, and by duration of the verbal activity by the subject upon the object. Reflexive and related forces (i.e., reciprocal and medial) arise only incidentally as a consequence of the deep personal interest and involvement of the subject in the action indicated by the verb. To be sure, the actual force of the infix-t depends in some measure upon the nature of the verb with which it is connected.
3. Secondary roots, reflected in both nominal and verbal forms, certainly

have arisen from infix-t forms. This is shown by developments in other Semitic languages besides Hebrew, but the development in the Hebrew language is shown most clearly by the use of such roots in the Talmud and other Jewish literature after the biblical period. The use of these secondary roots, however, did not commence until near the end of the Old Testament literature. From that point on, the use of viable infix-t constructions ceased, and the only remnants which existed were middle "t" and initial "t" words that now were treated as genuine tri-consonantal roots.

4. Finally, we conclude that infix-t constructions were a viable part of Biblical Hebrew during the major part of the biblical period. The forms here discussed are used with great flexibility and with excellent understanding of meaning. Even in rather late literature, such as Ezra-Nehemiah-Chronicles, the forms appear to be used with clear knowledge of their construction and force, even though their occurrence in late literature is not frequent. Perhaps they were already passing from vogue as Aramaic became more and more the spoken tongue of the Hebrew people.

On the basis of our study and its conclusions, we would reconstruct the use of "t" forms in the following manner. In Proto-Semitic, infix-t forms were the only means of expressing a particular kind of intensity. This intensity was that emotional urgency associated with religious ritual, magic, prophecy and the like. They expressed the deep personal involvement of the person in his activity which later branched out to include other than religious action.

Akkadian retained the infix-t as its only "t" construction

and developed it in peculiar and distinctive ways. Arabic added prefix-t forms, probably because of analogy with pronominal prefixes. Proto-Canaanite may well have known only infix-t, as indicated by the oldest strata of Phoenician and Ugaritic, where prefix-t, if it existed at all, existed only sporadically. Biblical Hebrew also knew only infix-t initially, in all likelihood, but prefix-t, paralleling the developments in later Phoenician and Arabic, crept into the language until it displaced infix-t altogether. Toward the end of the first millennium B.C., the use of infix-t ceased, and as time passed, knowledge of its existence passed from the minds of the scribes. Unknown or unrecognized t forms were expunged from the biblical text. Pointing was added, further obscuring the actual state of affairs, and the text was frozen by those who considered it too sacred to be tampered with. Thus, some hidden traces of infix-t forms exist, allowed to remain only because they were thought to be something else.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Aistleitner, Joseph. Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schramra. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1964.
- _____. Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Ugaritischen. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954.
- _____. Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965.
- The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Edited by Ignace J. Gelb, Thorkild Jacobsen, Benno Landsberger, A. Leo Oppenheim. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1956-1967.
- Bauer, Hans and Leander, Pontus. Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927.
- _____. Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des alten Testaments. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962.
- Bauer, Theo. Die Ostkanaanäer. Leipzig: Verlag der Asia Major, 1926.
- Beeston, A. F. L. A Descriptive Grammar of Epigraphic South Arabian. London: Lyzac & Co. Ltd., 1962.
- Bergsträsser, Gotthelf. Einführung in die semitischen Sprache. München: Max Hueber, 1928.
- _____. Hebräische Grammatik. Vol. I. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1929.
- Brockelmann, Carl. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen. 2 Vols. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1908-1913.
- Brockington, L. H. Syriac Grammar. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Brown, Francis; Driver, Samuel R. and Briggs, Charles A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959.

- Buccelati, Giorgio. *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*. Naples: Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1966.
- Castellino, G. R. *The Akkadian Personal Pronouns and Verbal System in the Light of Semitic and Hamitic*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962.
- Cooke, G. A. *A Text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr., and Freedman, David Noel. *Early Hebrew Orthography*. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1952.
- Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms I, 1-50*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965.
- _____. *Psalms II, 51-100*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1968.
- Dalman, Gustaf H. *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrash*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967.
- Davidson, B. *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Ltd., 1966.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Assyrische Grammatik*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1906.
- _____. *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896.
- Dillman, August. *Ethiopic Grammar*. 2nd ed. Enlarged and improved by Carl Bezold. Translated by James A. Crichton. London: Williams & Norgate, 1907.
- Driver, Godfrey Rolles. *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956.
- _____. *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.

- Driver, Samuel R. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1890.
- Dussaud, Rene. Les Monuments palestiniens et judaïques. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1912.
- Elias, Elias A. and Elias, Ed. E. Elias' Modern Dictionary, Arabic-English. 9th ed. Cairo: Elias' Modern Press, 1965.
- Fleisch, Henri. Introduction a l'étude des Langues sémitiques. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1947.
- Friedrich, Johannes. Phönizisch-punische Grammatik. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1951.
- Garbini, Giovanni. Il Semitico di Nord-Ovest. Naples: Istituto Univesitario Orientali, 1960.
- Gaster, Theodore. Thespis: Ritual Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East. New York: Schuman Publishing Co., 1950.
- Gelb, Ignace J. Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1961.
- Gesenius, William. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch. 2nd English edition. Revised by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1963.
- _____. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Translated by Edward Robinson. Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1844.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. Ugaritic Literature. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1949.
- _____. Ugaritic Textbook. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.
- Gray, Louis H. Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.
- Hammershaimb, E. Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Schamra. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1941.

- Harris, Zelig S. *The Development of the Canaanite Dialects*. New Haven, Conn.: The American Oriental Society, 1939.
- _____. *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1936.
- Höfner, Maria. *Altsüdarabische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Otto Harrossowitz, 1943.
- Huffman, Herbert B. *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 Vols. New York: Pardes Publishing House, Inc., 1950.
- Jouon, Paul. *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1947.
- Köhler, Ludwig and Baumgartner, Walter, eds. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. 2 Vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948-1953.
- _____. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexicon zum alten Testament*, Vol. I. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Knudtzon, J. A. *Die Tell-El-Amarna Tafeln*. 2 Vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1915.
- Landsberger, Benno. *Sam'al I*. Ankara: Druckerie der Turkischen historischen Gesellschaft, 1948.
- Lidsbarski, Mark. *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik*. 3 Vols. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Alfred Töpelmann), 1902-1915.
- Lisowsky, Gerhard. *Konkordanz zum hebräischen alten Testament*. Stuttgart: Privileg. Wurt. Bibelanstalt, 1958.
- Mandelkern, Solomon. *Concordantiae, Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae*. Tel Aviv: Schocken Publishing House Ltd., 1967.
- Mercer, Samuel A. B. *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets*. 2 Vols. Toronto: The MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1939.
- Montet, Pierre. *Byblos et L'Égypte*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1928.

- Moscatti, Sabatino. *Ancient Semitic Civilizations*. Capricorn Books. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1957.
- Moscatti, Sabatino; Spitaler, Anton; Ullendorff, Edward; Soden, Wolfram von. *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*. Edited by Sabatino Moscatti. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964.
- Noth, Martin. *The Old Testament World*. Translated by Victor I. Gruhn. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1966.
- O'Leary, De Lacy. *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1923.
- Pei, Mario A. and Gaynor, Frank A. *Dictionary of Linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
- Richardson, H. Neil. *A Practical Handbook for the Study of Biblical Aramaic*. Boston: Boston University Bookstores, 1965.
- Rosenthal, Franz. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961.
- Smend, R. and Socin, A. *Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab*. Freiburg: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung von J. C. B. Mohr, 1886.
- Soden, Wolfram von. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1952.
- Sperber, Alexander. *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.
- Stevenson, William B. *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924.
- Thatcher, G. W. *Arabic Grammar*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- Ungnad, Arthur. *Grammatik des Akkadischen*. Revised by Lubor Matouš. München: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1964.
- Wortabet, John and Porter, Harvey. *English-Arabic and Arabic-English Dictionary*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1954.

- Wright, William. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. 3rd ed. Revised by W. Robertson Smith and M. J. de Goeje. 2 Vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1967.
- _____. *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1890.
- Young, G. Douglas. *Concordance of Ugaritic*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1956.

ARTICLES

- Albright, William Foxwell. "Is the Mesha Inscription a Forgery?" *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 35 (1944-1945), 247-250.
- _____. "The North Canaanite Poems of Aly'ôyân Ba'al." *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, 14 (1934), 122, note 105.
- _____. "Notes on Early Hebrew and Aramaic Epigraphy, 2. An Unexplained Word in the Kilamûwa Stele." *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, 6 (1926), 84-85.
- _____. "The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Tenth Century B.C. from Byblus." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 67 (1947), 153-157.
- Bauer, Hans. "Die hebräischen Eigennamen als sprachliche Erkenntnisquelle." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 48 (1936), 77.
- Bruce, F. F. "Tell El-Amarna." *Archaeology and Old Testament Study*. Edited by D. Winton Thomas. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Burney, C. F. "On Certain Palestinian Place Names." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 23 (1912), 83-84.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr., and Freedman, David Noel. "The Blessing of Moses." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 67 (1948).
- Dahood, Mitchell. "The Linguistic Position of Ugaritic in the Light of Recent Discoveries." *Sacra Pagina*. Vol. I. Edited by J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and E. Massaux. Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1959.

- _____. "Philological Notes on Jer. 18:14-15." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 74 (1962), 207-209.
- _____. "Review of *Il Semitico di Nord-Ovest* by Giovanni Garbini." *Orientalia*, 32 (1963), 498-500.
- _____. "Some Remarks on a Recent Publication." *Orientalia*, 34 (1965), 36.
- Dombrowski, Bruno W. W. "Some Remarks on the Hebrew Hithpa'el and Inversative -T- in the Semitic Languages." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 21 (1962), 220-223.
- Driver, Godfrey Rolles. "Hebrew Language." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 1966. Vol. XI.
- _____. "Problems of the Hebrew Text and Language." *Alttestamentliche Studien*, Friedrich Nötscher zum sechzigsten Geburtstage, 19. Juli 1950. Dargeboten von Herbert Junker und Johannes Botterweck. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1950.
- Eisler, Georg and Lewy, Julius. "Die Altassyrischen Rechtsurkunden vom Kultepe, Kollationsergebnis, Beachtungen und Nachträge." *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Agyptischen Gesellschaft*, 35 (1935), 169, note 1.
- Freedman, David Noel. "The Biblical Languages." *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*. Edited by Philip Hyatt. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Goetze, Albrecht. "The t-Form of the Old Babylonian Verb." *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, 56 (1936), 297-334.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. "The Patterning of Root Morphemes in Semitic." *Word*, 6 (1950), 162-181.
- Grintz, Jehoshua M. "On the Original Home of the Semites." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 21 (1962), 186-206.
- Kramer, Samuel N. "The Verb in the Kirkuk Tablets." *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. XI (1929-1930), 63-119.
- Landsberger, Benno. "Die Eigenbegrifflichkeit der babylonischen Welt." *Islamica*. Vol II (1926).
- Leslau, Wolf. "Semitic Languages." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 1968. Vol. XX.

- Meyer, Rudolf. "Aspekt und Tempus im althebräischen Verbalssystem." *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 49 (1964), 118-126.
- Milik, J. T. "Deux documents inédits du Desert de Juda." *Biblica*, 38 (1957), 252, note 2.
- Montgomery, James A. "Some Oracle Place Names." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 54 (1935), 61-62.
- . "Two Notes on the Kalamu Inscription." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 47 (1928), 196-197.
- Moran, William J. "The Hebrew Language in Its Northwest Semitic Background." *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by G. Ernest Wright. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1961, 54-72.
- Murphy, R. E. "A Fragment of an Early Moabite Inscription from Dibon." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 125 (February, 1952), 20-23.
- Nöldelke, Theodore. "Semitic Languages." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 9th ed. Vol. XXI.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. *Digest of Discussions Concerning the Meaning and Function of the Akkadian Verbal Forms with t-Infix*. Xeroxed.
- . "Die mittels T-Infixes gebildeten Aktionarten des Altbabylonischen." *Weiner Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlands*, 42 (1935), 1-30.
- . "Die Rolle der T-Formen im Codex Hammurapi." *Weiner Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 40 (1933), 181-220.
- Peiser, F. E. "Die neue Inschrift aus Sendschirli." *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 12 (1911), 540-545.
- Poebel, Arno. "Unrecognized Forms of I/3 Formation." *Studies in Akkadian Grammar No. 1*. *Assyriological Studies 9*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1939.
- Rabin, C. "The Origins of the Subdivisions of Semitic." *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver*. Edited by D. Winton Thomas and W. D. McHardy. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1963.

- Reed, William L. and Winnett, Fred V. "A Fragment of an Early Moabite Inscription from Kerak." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 175 (October, 1964), 50-51.
- San Nicolo, M. "Juristische Bemerkungen zur Bedeutung der t-Formen des akkadischen Zeitwortes." *Orientalia*, 7 (1938), 309-318.
- Segert, Stanislav. "Die Sprache der moabitischen Königsinschrift." *Archiv Orientální*, 29 (1961), 250-259.
- Soden, Wolfram von. "Verbalformen mit doppeltem t-Infix im Akkadischen." *Orientalia*, 25 (1956), 385-396.
- Speiser, E. A. "The Durative Hithpa'el: A Tan Form." *Oriental and Biblical Studies*. Edited by J. J. Finkelstein and Moshe Greenberg. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1967.
- Torrey, Charles C. "The Ahiram Inscription of Byblos." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 45 (1925), 269-279.
- . "The Zakar and Kalamu Inscriptions." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 35 (1915), 364-369.
- Ullendorff, Edward. "Biblical Languages. A. Old Testament Languages." *A Companion to the Bible*. Edited by T. W. Manson and newly edited by H. H. Rawley. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963, 11-18.
- . "What Is a Semitic Language?" *Orientalia*, 27 (1958), 66-75.
- Ungnad, Arthur. "Die t-Form des akkadischen Verbs." *Orientalia*, 6 (1937), 252-255.
- Vincent, L. H. "Les fouilles de Byblos, 2. L'inscription phenicienne." *Revue Biblique*, 34 (1925), 183-193.
- Yahuda, A. E. "The Story of a Forgery and the Mesha Inscription." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 35 (1944-1945), 139-164.

Vita

Name: Milton Lorimer Boyle, Jr.

Date of Birth: March 14, 1928

Place of Birth: Medford, Massachusetts

Father's Name: Milton Lorimer Boyle

Mother's Name: Etta I. Boyle

Education: Harvard University, A.B., 1950.

Andover-Newton Theological School, B.D., 1963.

Boston University Graduate School, Ph.D., 1969.

Educational Positions: Curry College, Milton, Massachusetts
Registrar and Assistant Professor of
Religion, 1964-1969.